



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Qt14.398

Bound

JAN 26 1909



Harvard College Library

FROM

By Exchange

1000

1874. 1907

The Article in Theocritus

BY

WINFRED GEORGE LEUTNER

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1907

5/5

gt 14.398

Harvard College Library

JUL 11 1908

From the University
by exchange

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
BIBLIOGRAPHY	5
PREFACE	9
INTRODUCTION	11
A. SUBSTANTIVE ARTICLE	24
I. Demonstrative	24
II. Relative	30
B. ADJECTIVE ARTICLE	31
1. With objects present to the senses	31
2. " " previously mentioned	32
3. " " present to the mind	34
4. " " marked as customary, proper, etc.	35
5. With possessive value	35
6. With proper names	38
a. Names of persons	38
b. " " divinities	45
Oaths	47
c. Names of peoples in the plural	47
d. " " cities	47
e. " " rivers	48
f. " " mountains and promontories	48
g. " " islands	48
h. " " countries	48
i. " " seas	48
k. " " vessels and statues	48
l. " " festivals	49
m. " " constellations	49
n. " " winds	49
o. Natural divisions of time	49
p. Χρόνος, Θάλασσα, γῆ	50
r. Βασιλεὺς, βασιλεια	50
7. The generic article	50
8. With substantivized words and phrases	53
a. Adjectives	53
b. Participles	54

Table of Contents.

c. Adverbs.....	56
d. Prepositional phrases.....	57
e. Infinitives.....	57
9. With appositive nouns.....	58
10. With the predicate.....	60
11. With nouns accompanied by attributive adjectives.....	61
12. Predicative position.....	65
13. In genitive combinations.....	67
14. With possessives and genitives of personal and reflexive pronouns.....	70
15. With interrogatives.....	73
16. With <i>ἄλλος</i> and <i>ἕτερος</i>	73
17. With <i>ἐκαστος</i>	74
18. With <i>ἐκάτερος</i> , <i>ἀμφω</i> , and <i>ἀμφοτέρως</i>	74
19. With <i>οὗτος</i> , <i>ὅδε</i> , <i>τῆνος</i> , and <i>ἐκεῖνος</i>	74
20. With demonstrative adjectives.....	77
21. With <i>αὐτός</i>	77
22. With <i>πᾶς</i> , <i>ἅπας</i> , <i>σύμπας</i> , and <i>ὅλος</i>	78
23. With numerals.....	79
24. With superlatives.....	79
25. With comparatives.....	80

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

GENERAL GRAMMATICAL WORKS.

- Bernhardy, G., *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Berlin, 1829.
- Brugmann, K., *Griechische Grammatik-Müllers Handbuch*, II¹, 3. Ed. 1900.
- Buttmann, A., *Des Apollonios Dyskolos vier Buecher ueber die Syntax*. Berlin, 1877.
- Krueger, K. W., *Historisch-philologische Studien*, Vol. II. Berlin, 1851.
- Krueger-Poekel, *Griechische Sprachlehre*. Leipzig, 1875-1894. (Referred to simply as Krueger.)
- Kuehner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig, 1898. (Referred to simply as Kuehner.)
- Madvig, J. N., *Syntax of the Greek Language*. London, 1873.
- Monro, D. B., *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford, 1891.
- Schoemann, G. F., *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen*. Berlin, 1862.
- Vogrinz, G., *Grammatik des Homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn, 1889.

SPECIAL WORKS DEALING WITH THE ARTICLE.

- Ameis, C., *Ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels in den griechischen Bukolikern*. Muehlhausen, 1846.
- Blass, Fr., *Rheinisches Museum* XLIV (1889), 101 ff. (Reviewed *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XI, 107.)
- Brugmann, K., *Die Demonstrativpronomina in den Indogermanischen Sprachen*, *Abhandl. der Koenigl. Saechsischen Gesellsch. d. Wiss.* XXII, No. VI. Leipzig, 1904.
- Dornseiffen, I., *De articulo apud Graecos eiusque usu in praedicato*. Amsterdam, 1856.

- Eichhorst, O., Die Lehre des Apollonius Dyscolus vom Artikel. *Philologus*, xxxviii, 399 ff.
- Die Lehre des Apollonius Dyscolus vom articulus postpositivus. Wehlau, 1882.
- Foerstemann, H., Bemerkungen ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Homer. Magdeburg, 1861.
- Fuller, A. L., De articuli in antiquis Graecis comoediis usu. Leipzig, 1888.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., *Amer. Jour. of Phil.*, in various places as cited below.
- Herbst, L., *Philologus*, xxxviii, 502 ff.; xl, 374 ff.
- Kallenberg, H., Studien ueber den griechischen Artikel. I.—bei Namen von Laendern, Staedten und Meeren in der griechischen Prosa. *Philol.* XLIX, 515 ff. II.—bei Flussnamen, bei Gebirgsnamen. Berlin Pr., 1891. Der Artikel bei *πᾶς*, *οὗτος*, *ἐκεῖνος* und *ὅδε* in Herodot. *Jahresb. des Philol. Vereins zu Berlin*, 1897, xxiii, 204 ff.
- Middleton, T. F., The Doctrine of the Greek Article, etc. 4th ed. by Rose. London, 1841.
- Milden, A. W., Limitations of the Predicative Position in Greek. J. H. U. dissertation, 1900.
- Proksch, A., Ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels insbesondere beim Praedikat. *Philol.* xl, 1 ff.
- Schildener, H., Der griechische Artikel. Jahns Jahrb., 1851. *Suppl.*, xvii, 101 ff.
- Schmidt, C., De articulo in nominibus propriis apud Atticos scriptores pedestres. Kiel, 1890.
- Stein, R., De articuli apud Pindarum usu. Breslau, 1868.
- Uckermann, W., Ueber den Artikel bei Eigennamen in den Komoedien des Aristophanes. Berlin, 1892.
- Völker, F., Syntax der griechischen Papyri, I. Der Artikel. Münster (Program) 1903.
- Zucker, A., Beobachtungen ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Personennamen in Xenophons Anabasis. Nuernberg, 1899;

EDITIONS OF THEOCRITUS.

- Ahrens, H. L., Theocritus, Bion, Moschus. I. Text, II. Scholia. Leipzig, 1855.
- Theocritus, Bion, Moschus ; Ed. minor, Teubner. Leipzig, 1902.
- Cholmeley, R. J., The Idylls of Theocritus, with English notes, etc. London, 1901.
- Fritzsche, Ad. Th. Arm., Theocriti Idyllia. Editio altera parabilior. Leipzig, 1870.
- Theokrits Gedichte, 2. ed., 1869 ; 3. ed., by Ed. Hiller. Leipzig, 1881.
- Hartung, J. A., Theokrit, Bion und Moschus, griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung. Leipzig, 1858.
- Kiessling, Th., Theocritus, Bion et Moschus, Graece et Latine. London, 1829.
- Lang, A., Theocritus, Bion and Moschus. Rendered into English prose. London, 1901.
- Meineke, Aug., Theocritus, Bion et Moschus. 3. ed., Berlin, 1856.
- Snow, H., The Idylls and Epigrams of Theocritus. Oxford, 1873.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Bucolici Graeci. Oxford.
- Wuestemann, E. F., Theocriti Reliquiae. Gotha, 1830.
- Ziegler, Chr., Theocriti Carmina. 3. ed., Tuebingen, 1879.

MISCELLANIES.

- Hiller, Ed., Beitræge zur Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker. Leipzig, 1888.
- Legrand, Ph. E., Étude sur Théocrite. Paris, 1898.
- Rumpel, J., Lexicon Theocriteum. Leipzig, 1877.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v., Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker. Berlin, 1906.
- Ziegler, Chr., Codicis Ambrosiani 222. Scholia in Theocritum. Tuebingen, 1867.

PREFACE.

The following study embraces the thirty idylls of Theocritus found in the edition of Fritzsche, and the nine epigrams accepted as genuine by both Ahrens and Fritzsche. In referring to the idylls, the numbering employed by most editors, as found in Fritzsche, is used, while in reference to epigrams the order (I-IX), found in Ahrens, is kept, but the numbering of Fritzsche, and most editors, is given in brackets.

The monograph of Ameis mentioned above in the bibliography, and frequently referred to below (always as "Ameis"), was published as a specimen chapter of a proposed lexicon of the bucolic poets. The treatment of the article in Theocritus there given does not aim at completeness, and only the more important features are pointed out.

THE ARTICLE IN THEOCRITUS.

INTRODUCTION.

Before proceeding to the examination of the article as it is used by Theocritus, it will be well to consider briefly the leading facts of its origin, and the development of its various functions.

The demonstrative origin of the Greek article is a well recognized fact, attested as well by comparison with other languages of the Indo-European family, as by the literary monuments of the early language, and the persistency with which the demonstrative force attaches to the article through all periods of its history. This demonstrative origin was recognized by the Stoics, who rightly classed the article among the pronouns. It appears, however, that grammarians probably as early as Aristarchus considered the article (τὸ ἄρθρον) a separate part of speech entirely distinct from pronouns (ἀντωνυμῖαι). (See Schoemann, "Lehre von den Redetheilen," p. 117 f.)

The first use of a demonstrative seems to be to point to something that is actually present to the senses, a function called by Apollonius Dyscolus¹ a δέιξις τῆς ὀψέως.² That is, the demonstrative is local, and has relatively strong emphasis, which is augmented by actual gesture. Out of this function develops naturally the one whereby appeal is made, not directly to the senses, but to the intellect and mental experience, called by Apollonius (l. c.) a δέιξις τοῦ νοῦ. The reference is then to something that is known, or assumed to be known, either from previous experience or, more immediately, as the result of previous mention. It is the recall of a previously recognized object—

¹ περὶ συντάξεως II. 3., page 99. 9, Bekker.

² Brugmann, "Die Demonstrativpronomina," p. 15.

—*ἀναφορά, ἀναπόλησις*.¹ The element of actual gesture is lost, and the pronoun depends for its emphasis on the position it occupies, and the tone in which it is uttered. It was in this *ἀναφορά*, its most common function, that the grammarians saw the real nature of the article. Apollonius emphasizes this in various places, especially Synt. I. 6. p. 26 (Bekker), where he says, "Ἔστιν οὖν . . . ἴδιον ἄρθρου ἢ ἀναφορά, ἥ ἐστὶ προκατειλεγμένου προσώπου παραστατική.

The demonstrative nature of the article is clearly seen in another use to which it is put. When two sentences are coordinated, a demonstrative, by virtue of its power of *ἀναφορά*, may be used at the head of the second to connect the two sentences by referring to an antecedent contained in the first. Originally a paratactic relation, this connection of two sentences develops into a hypotactic relation, in which the second sentence is made dependent upon the first, and the connecting demonstrative becomes a relative.² In Attic Greek the form of demonstrative which is used in this way is the relative pronoun properly so called, *ὅς*, etc., but the article, as a demonstrative, can also appear in this role. Where there is still a shifting between parataxis and hypotaxis, it is sometimes doubtful, whether the postpositive sentence, with the article at its head, is dependent or not, whether the article is demonstrative or relative.³ Since the use of the article as relative depends upon its power of *ἀναφορά*, it is natural, that the clause in which it stands regularly follows the clause containing the antecedent, and that the antecedent is definite.⁴

¹ Apollonius Synt. I. 6. p. 26 (Bekker), cf. I. p. 48, II. 26–28, II. 3. p. 98, II. 25. 26, etc.

² See Professor Gildersleeve, "Problems in Greek Syntax," *A. J. P.* xxiii, pp. 255 f.

³ Cf. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik* § 642. Apollonius distinguished two kinds of article, the "prepositive," *ἄρθρον προτακτικόν*, and the "postpositive," *ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν* (Synt. I, 43, p. 85, l. 12 ff. (Bekker)). All the later Greek grammarians followed him in this (Eichhorst, "Die Lehre des Apollonius D. vom articulus postpositivus," p. 1), while modern grammar no longer considers the postpositive form an article, but a pronoun, viz., the relative pronoun.

⁴ Apollonius saw difficulty in cases where the relative precedes, with an indefinite antecedent, and consequently, when *ὅς* is so used he no longer called it an article but an *ἀόριστον μόριον*. (See Eichhorst, *o. c.*, page 5.)

It is but logical to suppose that in its earliest conception the demonstrative was adapted to use as an adjective as well as a substantive demonstrative. Mere juxtaposition of the substantive with a noun would be sufficient to bring about a reduction of the substantive demonstrative to an adjective. Clear indications of this process of reduction are seen in Homer. It is attended by a decrease also of its pure demonstrative value, tho in Homer this is still well preserved.¹ Just as the pronominal demonstratives, so the adjective demonstratives, including the article, serve for sensual demonstration, *δείξῃς τῆς ὄψεως*, and mental demonstration, *δείξῃς τοῦ νοῦ*, *ἀναφορά*. Between these two kinds of demonstration there is often but a very slight difference, and by a simple gesture a *δείξῃς τοῦ νοῦ* may be made an actual *δείξῃς τῆς ὄψεως*. (Cf. Theocr. Id. xv. 63).

We have said that Apollonius and others saw in *ἀναφορά* the real nature of the Greek article. What Apollonius included under *ἀναφορά* can best be seen from his own words, Synt. I, 6, p. 26, l. 14 ff (Bekker). There after saying that ἴδιον ἄρθρου ἢ ἀναφορά, he continues: 'Αναφέρεται δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα ⁽¹⁾ ἥτοι κατ' ἐξοχήν, [our 'par excellence,' 'the famous,' etc.]. . . ⁽²⁾ ἢ καὶ κατὰ μοναδικὴν κτῆσιν. ὁ γὰρ οὕτως ἀποφαινόμενος, δοῦλός σου ταῦτα ἐποίησε, πλῆθος ὑπαγορεύει δούλων. ὁ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἄρθρου, ὁ δοῦλός σου ταῦτα ἐποίησε, μοναδικὴν κτῆσιν ὑπαγορεύει.² ⁽³⁾ Ἡ καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ μόνον ἀπλὴν ἀναφορὰν [simple anaphora, of a thing previously mentioned, or known]. This passage has been quoted at length because of a misapplication of part of it by Krueger in his grammar, I, 50. 2. 3. There, after stating: "Gleichfalls deiktisch steht der Artikel, insofern der Begriff als einem bevorschwebenden Gegenstande natürlich, notorisch oder üblicher Weise zukommend gedacht wird, wo er dann oft als schwächeres Possessiv erscheint," he cites in support of the last part of his statement Apollonius

¹The essential difference between the early adjective article and the real Attic article lies in the fact that the latter had become customary or obligatory in certain cases to mark an object as definite and known. In this sense the use of the adjective article is denied to Homer.

²Cf. Apollonius, page 71, l. 28 f.

Synt. I, 36, p. 72, Cf. 39, p. 79 : 'Μοναδικαὶ οὖσαι αἱ κτήσεις τὸ ἄρθρον ἀπαιτοῦσιν.' Compare Milden, "Limitations of the Predicative position in Greek," page 9, to a similar intent. But it is clear, from the passage cited from Apollonius, and from a comparison with the places cited by Krueger, that Apollonius is referring to the use of the article with nouns accompanied by possessives or genitives of personal pronouns (or nouns), and means to show that the articular noun in such cases designates an object as the *sole* possession of its kind : δοῦλός σου, a slave of yours (you may have many), ὁ δοῦλός σου, your *only* slave. More exactly stated this means, if *sole* possession is to be indicated the article must be used, if not, the article may be omitted.¹ As a matter of fact, what we call a "possessive" use of the article is not recognized by Apollonius as far as can be discovered, is in fact merely a modern category adopted for convenience to characterize a certain phase at ἀναφορά.

Logically then, the Attic article marks an object as definite and known. The generic article is no exception, for it picks out an individual and lets it stand as typical of its class.² The ancient grammarians recognized a generic article, and Apollonius³ says, "ἀοριστώδης ἡ σύνταξις γίνεται τοῦ ἄρθρου", in cases, namely, like "ὁ δειπνήσας παῖς κοιμάσθω", and adds that the Stoics also recognized this use of the article. What marks the difference between the generic article and the specific article is that, while the latter became obligatory in certain cases, the generic article never became a necessity.⁴

The use of the adjective article with substantivized participles was not recognized by Apollonius,⁵ except in a few isolated cases, tho he did admit its use in the case of other parts of speech used substantively.⁶ As substantivized participles Apollonius accepted

¹ Eichhorst, *Philol.* 38. 413, correctly interprets the passage thus.

² Cf. Professor Gildersleeve, "Problems, etc.," p. 122.

³ Synt. I, 34, p. 68 (Bekker).

⁴ See Professor Gildersleeve, *l. c.*

⁵ See Buttmann, *Apol. Dyc. Synt.*, p. 83, note 3 to 108. 20.

⁶ Synt. p. 22, l. 15 ff (Bekker).

only such few as had become genuine substantives by common usage, and with these only he admitted the use of the adjective article. In other cases he viewed the article as a pronoun to which the participle was added as an attributive.

Because of its defining power the article is used to distinguish subject from predicate, the definite subject being articular, and thus it becomes a rhetorical means to avoid ambiguity.¹ But the predicate also admits the article, in its deictic as well as generic uses, and then subject and predicate are logically equivalent.

It is beyond the scope of this study to trace the history of the Greek article in all its functions. We need only consider briefly a few important facts of usage which will help us to fix the position of Theocritus.

The substantive article has the widest range and the freest use in the epic of Homer. In the *Iliad*, we are told,² δ , η , $\tau\acute{o}$ is used as a demonstrative pronoun 3000 times, as adjective article 218 times, or in the ratio of 14 to 1; and in the *Odyssey* the pronominal use occurs 2178, the adjectival 171 times, in the ratio of 13 to 1. In common with Homer, the lyric poets, as well as the tragic poets often use the article as pronoun, rarely with prepositions,³ the latter oftenest in Euripides. Figures need scarcely be adduced, if they were available, to show the vast difference in the relative frequency of the pronominal and adjective article between Homer and Attic prose. Under the constantly degrading influence of the adjective article and the simultaneous growth of other demonstrative pronouns, the pronominal article became more and more closely confined until it was reduced in Attic to the sphere of a few fixed expressions. On the other side, the adjective article, tho rare in Homer and Hesiod, had won a secure foothold and contained at least potentially all the functions that the later article actively displayed. In Hesiod⁴ the demonstrative use of

¹ Cf. Theon *Progymnasmata*-Spengel *Rhetores Graeci*, II, 83.

² Stummer, "Ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Homer," *Münnerstadt*, 1886, p. 56—quoted by Vogrinz, p. 198.

³ Bernhardt, p. 312.

⁴ Kuehner, § 458. 1.

the article corresponds to the Homeric use, but the real article as we find it in Attic is said to be excluded altogether. Late epic writers, especially Apollonius, seem to have reverted consciously to the Homeric use of the article.¹ We shall see presently to what extent Theocritus follows the same line. When we come to lyric poetry we find that the article proper is again very rare. The farther the poetry is removed from the language of everyday life, the less scope it affords for the article. So, in Pindar the article is a rare phenomenon, and the old demonstrative meaning usually lies close at hand.² In the lyrical portions of tragedy likewise, the real article is little used, and even in dialogue it is far less frequent than in Attic prose. Late dithyrambic writers carried the avoidance of the article to excess, and in Telestes it does not occur.³ Comic poetry, on the other hand, approximates the popular language, and consequently we find an increased use of the article. Not only is this true of Aristophanes, but the fragments of Epicharmus indicate the same for the old Dorian comedy. But even in comedy the differences between lyric and dialogue must be taken into account, besides the elements of parody, paratragedy and mock heroic. In prose, it need scarcely be said, the article as such reached its highest development and freest use, especially in Plato. Coming now to a later period, a little later than Theocritus, if we examine the mimes of the Dorian Herondas, who wrote in Ionic, and in a sphere closely related to that of the Doric-bucolic idylls of Theocritus, we find that the article is used with a frequency that equals if it does not actually exceed that found in Aristophanes.⁴

When we take up Theocritus, a few general considerations must be kept in mind in order to obtain a clear picture of his usage. Alexandrian literature is characterized by a studied imitation of earlier models, especially the epic of Homer. This imitation was extended to departments not strictly epic, and is shown by the revival of archaisms in form, vocabulary and syntax. That

¹ Kuehner, *l. c.*

² See Professor Gildersleeve, *Introductory Essay to his Pindar*, p. ci, and Stein's dissertation.

³ Smyth, "Greek Melic Poets," p. 465. ⁴ See table, p. 19.

Theocritus is never entirely free from this Alexandrian influence is to be expected. Judged, however, by the Doric idylls, it must be admitted that he was poet enough not to allow his own fresh and natural impressions to suffer under the influences active in his time at the expense of realism and truth. The language of these rural idylls, it is true, is far from being a pure Doric—a fact for which allowance is to be made in any application to Theocritus of K. O. Müller's statement¹ that a free and familiar use of the article is characteristic of the Dorian dialect—yet the essential tone of the Sicilian shepherd speech remains. In the epic idylls, on the other hand, we expect to find an actual return to early models, and imitation of the Homeric epic. This imitation Theocritus carries out with a great degree of consistency. Any study, therefore, of the forms, syntax and style of our author must distinguish between these two principal types represented in the idylls: the Doric (bucolic, and urban mimi) and the epic (including one Ionic lyrical piece, *Id.* XII).² The differences between these two types are basic and penetrate the metrical form as well as the vocabulary and syntax. Karl Kunst³ showed the differences obtaining between the Doric and the epic idylls in the treatment of the hexameter. It needs only a glance at the tables given below to see how far apart are these two groups of idylls so far as the article is concerned.⁴ It is true that statistics based simply on the number of articles found in an author cannot present the facts in anything like their full light. There may be stretches of poetry or prose where the article would not

¹Dorier, III, p. 504.

²The small group of Aeolic poems stands closer to the epic than to the Doric idylls in the treatment of the article.

³*Diss. Philol. Vindob.* I, p. 1 ff.—cf. *A. J. P.* XXI, 352, VIII, 116.

⁴In the tables no attempt is made to separate the bucolic idylls in the narrower sense from the mimetic pieces, as Kunst did for metrical study, since no sharp lines can be drawn between the two classes of poems in the treatment of the article. It may be noted, however, that the mimetic pieces, II, XIV, XV, XX, XXI, XXVII, (XVIII), do not reach the highest average. *Idyl* XVIII, which Kunst puts for convenience with the 'Edyllia mimica,' stands because of its dialect at the end of the Doric group in the table, but represents a different type of poetry from the other Doric pieces, while *Id.* XII, Ionic lyric, belongs dialectically to the epic group, where Kunst also puts it.

be required, because of the form of the thought and the character of the nouns; and again there may be passages in which the form of the thought and the character of the nouns ordinarily require the article. That is to say, the frequency or infrequency of the article may be due to accident, or the nature of the thought expressed. Nevertheless, masses of figures from various authors would at least show the relative tendency in these authors. Unfortunately there are few statistics on the Greek article. All the available figures that have been found are incorporated in the tables given below. For the dramatic poets and Plato we are confined to the figures given by Fuller,¹ which have been augmented slightly by a personal count. For Homer the figures given by Stummer as cited by Vogrinz (p. 197) will have to serve. Personal count of the article in Herondas furnishes the basis for the figures quoted for that author. From the meagre statistics given for the dramatists no farreaching inferences can be drawn in a comparison with the figures for Theocritus. The tables show a far greater frequency of the article in the Doric idylls than in the tragedians, bringing them closer to Aristophanes. It is to be remembered, however, that in the case of the dramatists no distinction has been made between lyric on the one hand and dialogue on the other, tho quite the same differences may be expected to obtain between these elements in the drama, as between the different types represented in the idylls. Comparison with Herondas shows that in his mimes as a whole the average occurrence of the article is greater than in the Doric idylls of Theocritus taken as a whole. But the extremes in Herondas present no such differences as in Theocritus, as indeed the elements that go to make up the mimes of Herondas are not as varied as the elements in the Doric idylls of Theocritus. It may be assumed then, that these two writers (Theocritus in the Doric idylls) cannot be far apart in the use of the article. For the epic group of Theocritean idylls we may say, that here the poet in general follows the lines of Homer, tho with a degree of greater freedom in the addition of the adjective article.

¹ Diss., p. 117.

TABLE SHOWING THE FREQUENCY OF THE ARTICLE AND THE COMPARATIVE
FREQUENCY OF ARTICULAR AND ANARTHROUS NOUNS.¹

DORIC IDYLLS	Number of Lines	Substantive Articles	Average per Line	Article as Relative	Adjective Articles	Average per Line	Anarthrous Nouns	Articular Nouns	Total	Per cent. Articular
I	152	14	.092	2	80	.526	142	52	194	26.8
II	166	6	.036	2	84	.506	139	63	202	31.1
III	54	1	.018	2	42	.777	29	25	54	46.2
IV	63	—	—	1	57	.904	24	37	61	60.6
V	150	3	.02	3	124	.826	93	83	176	47.1
VI	46	10	.217	—	29	.630	36	19	55	34.5
VII	157	8	.05	2	52	.331	190	34	224	15.1
VIII	93	3	.032	—	64	.688	91	54	145	37.2
IX	36	5	.138	4	6	.166	59	6	65	9.2
X	58	—	—	1	52	.896	37	37	74	50.
XI	81	3	.037	3	38	.469	70	27	97	27.8
XIV	70	1	.014	1	24	.342	54	12	66	18.1
XV	149	4	.026	2	76	.510	119	48	167	28.7
XIX	8	1	.125	—	6	.75	9	5	14	35.7
XX	45	1	.022	—	19	.422	49	10	59	16.9
XXI	67	2	.029	2	54	.805	69	52	121	42.9
XXIII	63	2	.031	4	43	.682	66	33	99	33.3
XXVII	70	2	.028	1	24	.342	77	16	93	17.2
XVIII	58	—	—	2	10	.172	79	4	83	4.8
Total..	1586	66	.041	32	884	.557	1432	617	2049	30.1
EPIC										
XII	75	3	.04	1	20	.26	100	8	108	7.4
XVI	109	5	.045	1	6	.055	150	4	154	2.5
XVII	138	12	.086	2	6	.043	181	1	182	.5
XXII	223	25	.112	2	12	.053	331	3	334	.8
XXIV	138	9	.065	3	8	.057	210	5	215	2.3
XXV	281	37	.131	3	14	.049	388	8	396	2.
XXVI	38	3	.078	—	11	.289	41	2	43	4.6
Total..	1002	94	.093	12	77	.076	1401	31	1432	2.1
ION. LYR.										
XII	37	2	.054	—	11	.29	42	3	45	6.6
AEOLIC										
XXVIII	25	—	—	1	5	.20	37	2	39	5.1
XXIX	40	2	.05	1	14	.35	25	6	31	19.3
XXX	32	5	.156	—	17	.531	24	13	37	35.1
Total..	97	7	.072	2	36	.369	86	21	107	19.6
BERE- NIKE										
EPIGR.	5	1	.20	—	1	.20	9	1	10	10.
	54	1	.018	1	38	.703	40	22	62	35.4

¹In the statistics for articular and anarthrous nouns (columns 8-11), proper names, vocatives and predicates are excluded.

<i>Homer.</i>	Number Lines.	Substantive Articles.	Average per Line.	Adjective Articles.	Average per Line.
<i>Iliad.</i>	15693	3000	.191	218	.013
<i>Odyssey.</i>	12110	2178	.171	171	.014

	Adjective Arti- cles First 1000 ll. (Fuller).	* Entire Play-lines.	* Adjective Articles.	* Average per Line.
<i>Aeschylus. Prom. Vinc.</i>	210	1114	230	.206
<i>Sophocles. Oed. Tyr.</i>	303	1530	484	.316
<i>Euripides. Medea.</i>	159	1419	230	.162
" * <i>Iphig. Taur.</i>	257	1499	375	.250
<i>Aristophanes. Vespae.</i>	562	1537	810	.527
<i>Plato Phaedo.</i>	768			
<i>Theocritus*</i> { 1st 1000 ll. I-XI. 25.	606			

<i>Herondas.*</i>	Mime.	Number Lines.	Adj. Articles.	Average per Line.
	I	90	48	.533
	II	102	70	.686
	III	97	73	.752
	IV	95	64	.673
	V	85	47	.552
	VI	102	57	.558
	VII	129	70	.542
	Total.	700	429	.612

* Statistics marked (*) are based on a personal count.

Within each of the two principal groups of idylls the table shows wide divergences. This is especially noticeable in the pieces of the Doric group, and even within individual poems there are important variations as will be seen presently. At one pole stands *Id.* IV, 'la plus rustique de toutes' (Legrand, p. 242), with an average of .904 per line; at the other stands the troublesome and corrupt IX, with an average of only .166. Or, to take a more legitimate example than IX, *Id.* VII, the 'regina eclogarum' as Heinsius called it, of which large portions are lyric and descriptive, shows an average of .361 per line. *Id.* XVIII (Ἑλένης ἐπιθαλάμιος), tho of the same dialect, is so essentially different from the other Doric idylls as to require a place by itself. In it the average occurrence of the article per line sinks to .172. Between these extremes of the Doric group the tables show variety and gradation. We will return below to a consideration of some of the phenomena presented by individual idylls.

To turn briefly to the epic group, it will be seen that *Idd.* XIII and XXVI stand out above the rest with a freer use of the adjective article. In the case of XIII (Ἕκλας), however, it is to be noted that twelve of the twenty adjective articles in the idyl are found in the introductory verses (1-15), addressed to the poet's friend Nikias (at an average of .8 per line), while the remaining 8 articles are distributed over the sixty lines of the epyllion proper (at an average of .13 per line¹). In *Id.* XXVI (Ἀθήναι ἢ Βάκχαι), the opening verses (1-6), which give the setting as it were, contain five of the eleven articles. In the rapid account of the mystic rites, of the confusion at the discovery of Pentheus, and of the terrible punishment for his curiosity, the article disappears.

In order to complete the account of Theocritean usage it will be necessary to consider, in addition to the frequency with which the article appears, also the freedom with which it is omitted. In the last four columns of the table (p. 19) are given statistics comparing the number of articular nouns (exclusive of substantivized words), and anarthrous nouns (excluding from

¹The difference between the introduction and epyllion was noted by Professor Gildersleeve in his review of Legrand, *A. J. P.*, XXI, 352.

both counts proper nouns, and from the latter predicates and vocatives). The same objections must be admitted in the case of these figures as those mentioned above in connection with the preceding statistics. We can, however, learn from them approximately what the state of affairs is. In this discussion we may lay aside the epic idylls with the remark that, since they are Homeric imitations, a general omission of the article is normal. A few instances where the article is used with an extension that is not Homeric (Cf., xxv, 180 and 84) do not affect the general result. Among the Aeolic, lyric, pieces, only *Id.* xxx shows any degree of freedom in the use of the article. The others stand close to the epic group.

In the Doric poems, on the other hand, in accordance with what has already been said, the omissions of the article are far less numerous and varied. They are not confined to the cases where Attic prose may omit the article, nor, on the other hand, do they seem to be as extensive as in the tragic poets and perhaps even in Aristophanes, certainly far less extensive than in Homer, Hesiod and Pindar. Comparison with Herondas seems to indicate that there is no great difference between Theocritus and the author of the mimes.

Ameis (p. 23 f.) says simply that the article is omitted with great freedom by the bucolic poets in the case of common nouns unattended by attributives. He gives a list containing nearly seven hundred examples of such omissions from the idylls and epigrams of Theocritus—and the list is evidently not intended to be complete. He makes no attempt to distinguish between epic and Doric idylls, and an examination of the citations in the list shows that more than half the cases cited for Theocritus are taken from epic idylls. In a second list of examples (also incomplete and apparently chosen at random) of cases where the article is omitted with nouns accompanied by attributives, Ameis includes seventy-six examples from Theocritus. But here again no less than fifty-one are citations from epic idylls. While it is true, of course, that Theocritus makes use of his privilege as a poet, and omits the article freely even in the Doric idylls, yet simple lists and figures that do not discriminate between epic and Doric

idylls are apt to create false impressions. Many of the omissions of the article in Theocritus will be discussed below under the various categories. What is to be noted here is, that in nearly all of these categories a large proportion of the omissions are found in epic idylls. Furthermore, prepositional phrases and formulae figure to a considerable extent. By taking these things into account, as well as the fact that many of the omissions of the article are such as are permissible also in Attic prose, the margin of actually poetic omissions in the Doric idylls is greatly reduced. That metrical exigences may have determined the poet's choice in certain cases seems inevitable, but we cannot admit that the influence of metre was great enough or frequent enough to have interfered materially with the natural taste of the poet and so have affected his style.

Within individual idylls of the Doric group closer analysis shows considerable variation in the use and omission of the article. *Idyl* I may serve as an example. In the dialogue portions of this poem (ll. 1-28, 57-63, 143-152 = 45 lines) the article is used most freely (1.06 per line) and omissions with nouns of definite reference are correspondingly rare (of ten omissions, four are in prepositional phrases). Contrasted with this, stands the passage containing the description of the prize cup (ll. 29-56), where the article sinks to an average of .214 per line, with a corresponding increase in omissions (fifteen with nouns of definite reference). Commentators have long noticed the epic coloring in this passage, shown in epic forms, words and expressions, and in the free use of the substantive article.—The $\phi\delta\eta$ (ll. 64-142) occupies middle ground between the other two parts, with an average of .455 articles per line. Its tone is noticeably higher than that of the dialogue, and epic forms occur with considerable frequency. The tendency to greater freedom in the omission of the article in this $\phi\delta\eta$ than in the dialogue, might suggest similar conditions in other idylls where we have songs incorporated in the poems. An examination, however, of such idylls (viz. XI, XV, XVIII,—V, VI, VII, VIII, X) proves, that the song portions of the Doric idylls show no characteristic treatment of the article, different from other parts of the poems. Just so Legrand (p. 426) has shown, that

Theocritus does not aim to distinguish his pastoral songs from other parts of the idylls metrically or musically, and that the bucolic caesura is treated in the same way in the songs as in other portions (*ib.* p. 425).

For *Id.* II it may be noted that in the monologue of Simaetha (63–165), her address to the moon—a passage cited by Legrand (p. 262) as showing a greater proportion of epic forms—there is a falling off of the article (from an average of .451 in other parts to .216, the refrain counted once). So in *Id.* XIV the introductory dialogue shows few actual omissions of the article. But in the *ῥῆσις* of Aeschines they become more numerous, and in the rapid and excited account of the lover's quarrel with his mistress, the article disappears. This passage again is cited by Legrand (*l. c.*) as showing traces of epic diction.—In the rapid exchange of speech between the impassioned lover and the reluctant girl in *Id.* XXVII, there is a marked freedom in the omission of the article—especially with names of parts of the body, nouns of relationship, and nouns accompanied by possessives or genitives of personal pronouns. For *Id.* IX we may note great unevenness in the use of the article. Introduction (1–6), Menalkas' song (15–21), and narrative (14, 22–27) lack the article; the concluding address to the Muses (28–38) has but one article (32); while the remaining five articles of the piece, all generic, are found in the seven lines of Daphnis' song (7–13).

This analysis might be carried further and applied to each of the idylls. It has been carried far enough, however, for our purpose. We will proceed in the following to a detailed account of the use of the article by Theocritus.

A. SUBSTANTIVE USE OF THE ARTICLE.

I. *The article as a demonstrative pronoun.* The use of the article as a demonstrative pronoun is not restricted in Theocritus to the cases that are common in Attic prose, but includes also cases that are peculiar to the language of epic and appear occasionally in Attic poetry. The epic idylls naturally show a much freer use of the substantive (demonstrative) article than the

Doric idylls, because of conscious imitation of Homer.¹ It is seen, however, that even here the proportion of substantive to adjective articles is not nearly so great as in Homer.²

1. *The substantive (demonstrative) article, unaccompanied by a particle.* This is the least common use of the substantive article in Theocritus, as it is in Homer and the Attic poets. Fifteen cases occur, seven of them in epic idylls. It is found only in the oblique cases, and resumes an object previously mentioned either as subject or in an oblique case. In only three cases (I, 37, 91; xxv, 129) it is used with a preposition. In all cases save xvi, 40 the article stands in the thesis of the foot, and in eight at the head of the line. The occurrences are the following: I, 29, 37, 60, 91; vi, 43 (twice); vii, 103; ix, 33; xvi, 40; xvii, 85; xxii, 53, 161, 195; xxv, 129, 278.

The dative of the substantive article, unsupported by a particle is occasionally used as an adverb.³ So, τῷ, "therefore," xvii, 28, 38; xxv, 186; τῷ = "tūm," xxix, 11; τῇ, "there," xxv, 159. One of these stands outside the epic group, in the Aeolic xxix, and all stand in the thesis of the first foot.

2. *The substantive article accompanied by a particle.* This is far the commoner use of the substantive article. Most frequently the article so used stands at the head of a clause, followed by μέν, δέ, γάρ, δή, γέ, or preceded by αὐτάρ. This use, of which certain phases survive in Attic prose, is not so closely confined as the preceding, but occurs with considerable freedom also outside the epic idylls.

a. A use, characteristic as it is common, is the use in balanced clause of δ μέν and δ δέ: I, 48 δὲ ἀλώπεκες, ἃ μὲν . . . , ἃ δ'. Here ἃ μὲν . . . ἃ δέ, designating parts are put in apposition with the word signifying the whole (cf. Ameis, p. 9), as in Homer, Od. 12, 73, cf. Od. 18.95. A similar construction, with a noun in the singular designating the whole is found in a Skolion:⁴

ἃ ὅς ταν βάλανον ταν μὲν ἔχει ταν δ' ἔραται λαβεῖν.
καὶ γὰρ παῖδα καλὴν τὴν μὲν ἔχω τὴν δ' ἔραμαι λαβεῖν.—

¹ See table, introd., p. 20.

² See figures cited above from Stummer.

³ Ameis, p. 9.

⁴ Smyth, 'Greek Melic Poets,' p. 152, 18.

where the first line is spoken by a Dorian, while in the second an Athenian parodies the rustic taste of the Dorian (Smyth). An unusual application of this construction is that in *Id.* xxii, 112: *σάρκες δ' αἱ μὲν ἰδρῶτι συνίζανον, ἐκ μεγάλου δέ | αἰψ' ὀλίγος γένητ' ἀνδρός · δ δ' αἰεὶ πάσσονα γυνῖα | ἀπτόμενος φορέεσκε πόνου χροίῃ δέ τ' ἀμείνω*.—Instead of the expected αἱ δέ there is a shift here to the person, making the construction a mixed one: "but their bodies—that of the one kept shrinking . . . while the other (man) grew ever stronger."

Other instances of the use of δ μὲν . . . δ δέ in balanced clauses are: v, 94; vi, 2, 43; xi, 58; xv, 128; xvii, 30; xxx, 18–21. In the sense "some . . . some," "part . . . part," "some . . . others," we find δ μὲν . . . δ δέ: viii, 70; xvi, 24; xxv, 9 ff., 49; xxx, 4.

In place of either δ μὲν or δ δέ another pronominal form, or a noun may be used: ἡ μὲν . . . ὅς δέ xxvii, 68. τῷ μὲν . . . δ δέ xxii, 182. δ μὲν . . . ἐγὼ δέ ii, 138. οἱ μὲν . . . ἐμὴν δέ ix, 4. δ μὲν . . . αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ vii, 130. δ μὲν . . . τὸν δ' ἕτερον xii, 13. δ μὲν . . . ἄλλος δέ xxv, 102 ff. ἄμες μὲν . . . ἃ δέ xiv, 20. Πενθεὺς μὲν . . . αἱ δέ xxvi, 16.

In two cases the first member of the pair is omitted, but is implied in the preceding words: xvii, 105; xxv, 187.

b. δ δέ, οἱ δέ, etc., without a preceding δ μὲν, οἱ μὲν, etc. This use of the substantive article in the *nominative* case, at the head of a sentence, is one of the uses that survived even in Attic prose. It is frequent in Theocritus and is by no means limited to the epic idylls. As in Attic, the article here regularly marks a change of subject. Cases where there is no such change are rare in Attic, and no certain examples occur in Theocritus. The following cases, marking a change of subject, are found in Theocritus: i, 35, τὰ δ' οὐ φρενὸς ἄπτεται αὐτᾶς—τὰ δέ refers to the rivalries of the two lovers, as just described. The neuter plural referring to the general context of an immediately preceding sentence or clause is found again in the epic idyl xxii, 167 and 181.—i, 37. οἱ δ' . . . | . . . ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι, referring to the two objects of the foregoing sentence.—ii. 102. ἃ δ' ἦνθε, i. e. the maid addressed in the preceding line. In all other instances the

reference is, as in the examples quoted, to a person or thing either directly mentioned in the preceding sentence, in an oblique case, or clearly implied: VI, 10, 15, 26; VII, 128, 156; IX, 27; XI, 13; XIII, 47, 70; XV, 57; XVI, 8; XVII, 32, 62, 63; XIX, 3; XXII, 10, 80, 191, 198; XXIII, 53; XXIV, 12, 17, 30, 41, 55, 71; XXV, 94; XXX, 25.

It has been said that there is no certain example in Theocritus of δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ used at the head of a sentence in the nominative without a change of subject. A possible case is II, 61: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\thetaυ\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ · δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}$. But $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ is given by the mss., and if this reading is retained, δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ marks a new subject. The reading of the whole line is, however, open to question.

In two instances, in dialogue, an individual, addressed in a command—and so subject of an imperative—or in the nominative for the vocative, is referred to in a following clause by δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$: v. 149, and xv. 30.

The *oblique cases* of δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, etc. are likewise used without a corresponding δ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, to refer to persons or things previously mentioned or easily recognized from the context. The antecedent referred to is regularly subject of the preceding sentence or clause: I, 39, 100, 138; II, 48; VI, 20; VII, 27, 90; VIII, 8; XXII, 88; XXIII, 59; XXV, 1, 42, 51, 68, 126, 235.

In three instances an oblique case of δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ refers to an antecedent other than a subject of a preceding sentence: II, 78. (77) $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$ $\Delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\phi\iota\nu$ $\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\pi\pi\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ · $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ δ' $\eta\nu$ $\xi\alpha\nu\theta\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\chi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$.—XXIV, 10. $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\sigma\epsilon$ (sc. $\text{'}\Lambda\lambda\kappa\mu\acute{\eta}\nu\alpha$) $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$ · (in which lay the two infant brothers Herakles and Iphikles) $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ δ' $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta'$ $\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\nu\omicron\varsigma$.—XXVI, 14. (13) $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ δ' $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\xi\epsilon$ (sc. $\text{'}\Lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\acute{o}\alpha$) · . . . $\delta\rho\gamma\iota\alpha$ $\beta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\chi\omega$, | . . . $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ δ' $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\acute{o}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\iota$.¹

In apodoses of conditional and relative sentences Homer and Herodotus sometimes use δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (also in oblique cases) to refer to an antecedent in the subordinate clause (also in oblique cases²).

¹ MSS. $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ δ' . Meineke and Hiller $\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$; but Fritzsche—to VII. 59—correctly notes “nunquam videlicet Theocritus dixit $\tau\acute{o}\lambda\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$ cet. pro $\omicron\lambda\tau\epsilon$, $\alpha\lambda\tau\epsilon$ cet.”

² See Krüger, II, 50, 1, 11, and compare Homer II. XI, 409.

Such a use can also be cited for Theocritus in the following instances: IX, 36, οὐς γὰρ ὀρεῦντι | γαθεῦσαι (sc. Μοῖσαι), τοὺς δ' οὔτι ποτῶ δαλήσατο Κίρκη. XXIX, 17, καὶ μὲν σευ τὸ κάλον τις ἶδων ῥέθος αἰνέσαι, | τῷ δ' εὐθὺς πλέον ἢ τριέτης ἐγένεν φίλος. The δέ is in these cases the so-called apodotic δέ. In II, 124: καὶ μ' εἰ μὲν κ' ἐδέχασθε, τὰ δ' ἦς φίλα (where τὰδ' is preferred by some editors), τὰ δέ may be explained in the same way, as referring to the preceding context (as in I, 35, discussed above under 2 b.): "if you had received me, that had been dear to me." Compare the scholiast ad loc.: καὶ ταῦτα ἂν καλῶς εἶχεν (ἡμῖν); and: ἦν ἂν τοῦτο προσφιλές.¹

When the relative conditional clause follows the main clause, the case is slightly different, as in XVII, 74: δ δ' ἔξοχος, ὃν κε φιλήσῃ (sc. Ζεὺς) γεινόμενον τὰ πρῶτα.

c. δ μὲν, οἱ μὲν, etc., without a corresponding δ δέ, οἱ δέ, etc., in the nominative case resumes a person or thing previously mentioned and is always followed by a contrasted action of the same or of another subject. The nominative case never stands at the head of the sentence or clause, but is preceded by one or two particles—namely καί, εἰ δέ, ἦτοι, ὥς. Following instances occur in Theocritus: I, 138; VII, 90; XX, 17; XXI, 46; XXV, 45, 223; XXVI, 3; XXVII, 66.

The oblique cases of δ μὲν so used, with one exception (XXI, 58), stand at the head of the sentence. Of the fifteen occurrences, eleven are in epic idylls and a twelfth in the Ionic XII. In most cases the demonstrative refers to the subject of the preceding sentence. The occurrences may simply be noted. They are, I, 57; IX, 22; XII, 25; XVII, 36; XXI, 58; XXII, 102, 131, 196; XXV, 73, 92, 138, 145, 204, 250, 262.

d. The substantive article with other particles. Γάρ: The substantive article with γάρ, frequent in Homer, found occasionally in tragedy, in Pindar, and in Herodotus,² and cited even for Thucydides,³ occurs in Theocritus only in two epic idylls: XVII, 4;

¹ This is a more natural interpretation than that of Fritzsche who refers τὰ δέ to "Amici . . . quasi dicas vernacule 'das Völkchen' (those good fellows) v. 119."

² Krueger, II, 50, 1, 2.

³ See commentators to Thuc., I, 69, 2; VI, 36, 2.

xxv, 5, 44, 197, and in the Berenice frg., line 4.—Δή: τό δή, vii, 29.—Αὐτάρ: αὐτὰρ δ, xxii, 105; xxv, 232.

e. *The article as a substantive antecedent to a relative clause* is found in Homer, Pindar and Herodotus. In Attic prose it occurs with some degree of frequency only in Plato.¹ Even in epic diction this use is rare. Three examples may be cited for Theocritus from epic idylls: xvi, 5, τῶν ὅποσοι . . . ναίουσιν. xxii, 182, τὸ μὲν . . . ὃ γενεῇ προφέρεσκον. xxv, 193, τὸ μὲν ὅττι με πρῶτον ἀνῆρεν. In vii, 94, ἀλλὰ τό γ' ἐκ πάντων μεγ' ὑπείροχον <sc. διδάξαν>, ὃ τυ γεραίρειν ἀρξέυμ <αι>, most editors write τόγ' or τόδ'. This use of the article is simply a type of anaphora whereby the speaker or writer anticipates his own words and points forward to the following. The relative clause takes the place of a noun with the article. Compare Plato, Euthyd. 291 a.

f. *The noun to which δ μὲν or δ δέ refers may be added in apposition.* It is often separated from the article by a considerable interval. This form of expression begins in Homer and remains the property of epic also in Alexandrian times, especially in Callimachus. It is a form of deixis suited to the language of everyday life and, hence, is more frequent in Aristophanes and Plato than in the tragedians and historians.² In Homer it is most frequent in the nominative case, and with δ δέ, but is found also in the oblique cases.³ The occurrences in Theocritus, mostly in epic idylls, are confined to the nominative case, and in all save three instances to δ δέ: iii, 44; xiii, 17; xvii, 71; xxii, 27, 76, 91, 99, 109, 110, 137, 183, 203; xxiv, 26, 51; xxv, 86, 148, 153. In most cases the noun referred to by the article is clear from the context even before the addition of the apposition. An exception is xxi, 17, οὐδεὶς δ' ἐν μέσσω γείτων πέλεν· ἃ δὲ παρ' αὐτὰν | θλιβομένην καλύβαν τρυφερὸν προσέναχε θάλασσα.⁴ The indefiniteness of ἃ δέ, and its distance from θάλασσα cause

¹ Krueger, ii, 50, 2, 5, and i, 50, 1, 20. Cf. Gildersleeve to Justin Martyr A, i, 5, 8.

² Bernhardt, Wissenschaftliche Syntax, page 308.

³ Foerstemann, page 6.

⁴ Reiske's conjecture πέλεν· ἃ is now generally adopted for πενία of mss. 11, 18. M. and Edd. Junt. and Call. (Cholmeley πενία), and πάντη of the Aldine ed.

no difficulty. Such separation would not seem abnormal to a Greek.¹

II. *The article as a relative pronoun.* The use of forms of the article as relative pronouns is not found in Attic prose. That its use in this manner was not altogether foreign to Attic is evidenced by its appearance in private inscriptions.² The usage was continued in the *κοινή* and survives in modern Greek.³ In old Ionic it was frequent, but *ὅς* and *ὃς* are more common than *ὅ* and *τοῖ*.⁴ It was common also in Aeolic, Doric, and Neoionic. Herodotus so uses the forms with initial *τ*, but with prepositions also the ordinary relative, and with *τις* only the latter—tho Homer shows *ὅτις*, *ὅπερ*.⁵ The fragments of Epicharmus and the poems of Pindar offer examples for Doric. In Alexandrian poetry the Homeric use is freely imitated, and in Theocritus the article as relative occurs in most of the poems. The ordinary forms of the relative are of course far more common.

This relative use of the article is in general restricted in Theocritus as in Homer,⁶ to clauses that refer to a definite antecedent, and, therefore, regularly follow the antecedent clause. Two cases are cited from Homer where this rule is not observed, II. I, 125, Od. IV, 349 (= XVII, 140).⁷ In correlation with a demonstrative, forms of the article are not used as relatives. With one possible exception (XV, 86), only forms with initial *τ* are used as relatives by Theocritus. The antecedent is indefinite in but one instance: XXIX, 3, *κῆγ' ὃ μὲν τὰ φρένων ἐρέω κέατ' ἐν μύχῳ*. The article as relative, with a definite, preceding antecedent is found as follows: I, 47, 118; II, 12, 67; III, 22, 35; IV, 59; V, 8, 11, 93; VII, 59, 93; IX, 10, 23, 24, 29; X, 4, (v. l. *ἄς*); XI, 16, 47, 53; XIII, 57; XIV, 34; XV, 86, *ὃ τριφίλητος Ἀδωνις δ' κῆν Ἀχέροντι φιλεῖται*,⁸ 117; XVI, 102; XVII, 5, 128; XVIII, 25,

¹ Cf. Pindar, O, XI (x), 19, and Gildersleeve, ad loc.

² Meisterhans², 123, cf. Völker; "Syntax d. gr. Papyri," I, p. 6.

³ Brugmann, § 642.

⁴ Monro, 262.

⁵ Krueger, II, 25, 5.4.

⁶ Monro, § 262.

⁷ Brugmann, § 642, p. 559.

⁸ The only example of a form without initial *τ* used as relative. (For this use in Homer, cf. Krueger, II, 15, 1, 2). For the vulg. *δ* . . . *φιλεῖται*, Ahrens wrote *ὅς* after MS. p. — contrary to the metre, while Fritzsche followed Reiske in reading *ὃ* . . . *φιλητός*, from the variant *φιλήται* in some minor MSS., and early edd. Theocritus may have used *ὅ* simply for metrical reasons.

37; XXI, 38, 62; XXII, 55, 183 (?); XXIII, 9, 43, 46, 58; XXIV, 4, 29 (?), 114; XXV, 2, 34, 209; XXVII, 19; XXVIII, 10; Epigram VIII (XVII), 5.

B. ADJECTIVE USE OF THE ARTICLE.

1. *With objects present to the senses, δείξis τῆς ὄψεως.* From what has already been said of the origin of the article, it is clear that in its earliest stage the adjective article was used with the names of objects actually present to the senses. When the article was still largely implicit in the noun, its addition was necessarily attended by a certain degree of emphasis or direction. With the growth of other demonstratives, however, and the rapid extension of the article itself to wider uses, this emphasis decreased until by the time of the Attic period the adjective article in all its uses was relatively unemphatic. The Alexandrian poets, we are told,¹ often used the article with demonstrative force. If this is true, it can be due only to a conscious return to earlier models. In Attic and later Greek, when the article had long been fully developed, its use to point to things actually present was probably no more emphatic than any of its other uses, unless supported by actual gesture. This is true of our own definite article and that of modern German as well, tho both English and German use the article in this way with far less freedom than Greek, and more readily resort to stronger demonstratives. It is to be remembered that analysis into "objects present to the senses," "previously mentioned," "present to the mind," etc., is merely convenient categorization, and does not imply that there was to a Greek any difference in meaning between the article in one case and in another. Among the examples to be cited under the present category there are comparatively few where the simple article in English will not approximately give the value of the Greek article. For instance, when Battos (*Id.* iv, 1) asks Corydon, "τῖνος αἱ βόες"; the article evidently points to the cattle before him, and yet αἱ is by no means equivalent to αἷδε or αὐται. "Whose are the cows," or even "whose cows" practically puts as much emphasis upon

¹ Ostermann, *Jahnni Ann.* 1858, vol. 78, p. 361.

ai as was intended. Similarly, *Id.* I, 2, *ποτὶ ταῖς παραῖσι* is not "by yonder spring," or "by this spring," but simply "by the spring," the one, namely, in the landscape before us and the only one at this moment of special interest. Where emphasis is actually laid upon the location of a person or thing, the demonstratives are freely used, or, where the demonstrative pronoun is not added, the presence of some demonstrative form often supports the article, much like a gesture in actual conversation. So, for instance, *ᾧδε* (III, 38; IV, 51), *τείδε* (I, 12; V, 32), *δεῦρο* (I, 21; XXVII, 10, 12), *ἡνίδε* (V, 23), or a demonstrative standing with another noun in the immediate vicinity (I, 1, 8, 13, 23; V, 63, 101). In some other cases actual gesture must be imagined, as in XXII, 69, where Amycus refers to himself as *ὁ πύκτης*. The following cases of this use of the article, with objects present to the senses, have been noted, none, save XXII, 69, from epic idylls: I, 1, 2, 8, 13, 21, 23;—III, 38;—IV, 1, 44 (two), 45 (*τὸν θαλλόν*), 46, 50, 52 (two), 55;—V, 3, 24 (two, *ᾧριφος*,—with anaphora also to l. 21;—*τὸν εὔβοτον ἄμυόν*), 32, 47, 48, 49,¹ 63, 75, 78, 99, 100 (*τὰς κοτιῖνου*), 101, 102 (*τὰς δρυός*), 110 (*τὸν αἰπόλον*), 138;—VI, 11, 13;—VII, 43;—VIII, 27 (two), 44 (*χῶ ποιμήν* = *ἐγώ*; cf. VIII, 48, XXII, 69);—XV, 14, 27 (*τὸ νᾶμα*),² 65, 81, 89, 145 (*τὸ χρῆμα σοφώτερον! ἂ θήλεια*);³—XXII, 69;—XXVII, 10, 12, 57;—Epigram, I, (I), 1, 3;—IV, (XII), I, (*τὸν τρίποδα*);—IX (XXI), 2.

2. *With objects previously mentioned.* From a *δείξιν τῆς ὄψεως* to a *δείξιν τοῦ νοῦ* is but a short step, as we have seen, and the line between the two cannot in some cases be sharply drawn. The categories frequently overlap. By a *δείξιν τοῦ νοῦ* is meant reference to a definite object that is present to the *mind*. This mental presence is either due to the fact that the given object has

¹ In connection with the lines last quoted, 47–49, note *τουτεῖ, ᾧδε, ἐνθα*, ll. 45–47.

² *Nāma* seems to be a rare hyperdoric form for *nēma*, "sewing." *Nāma* from *nāw*, "liquid matter," belongs to a higher sphere, being especially common in the tragic poets, particularly Euripides, and nowhere occurs in the sense "basin of water," as would be required here, tho in idyl XXIII, 61 it is used of the water in a natatorium.

³ *Τὸ χρῆμα*, in the speech of the Syracusan woman refers to the singer of the Adonis song. The line is doubtful, but this reading and the interpretation of Fritzsche seems most reasonable. See for a discussion of the line, Legrand, p. 308.

previously come within the range of the hearer's mental experience and is suggested again by a present circumstance, or it is due more immediately to a direct mention or implication of the object in the preceding words. That Apollonius uses the term *ἀναφορά* in its widest sense to cover both these cases is clear not only from his triple division of this function, but also, because he speaks of *ἀναφορά* as presupposing in general a *προϋφειστώσα γνώσις*,¹ or, in a narrower sense, as a recall of a *προκατειλεγμένου προσώπου*.²

We will take up first the cases of simple anaphora of things that have been mentioned or implied. The article was used for this purpose as early as Homer's day, but while the emphasis upon this article was comparatively strong in the early period, in Attic and later Greek it was no longer so.

In contrast with the preceding category, it is to be noted that no small number of the examples to be cited here are found in epic idylls, and a large proportion of the others occur in narrative passages. I, 41, *ὁ πρέσβυς*, i. e. the *γριπεὺς γέρων* of l. 39,³ 50, 61, 92, 143 (two), 149;—II, 36, 72, 159;—IV, 22 (*ὁ δᾶμος*, the deme of *τοὶ δαμόται* of line 21), 37, 52 *ἁ πόρτις*;—V, 24, 30, 61, 139, 144, 149;—VII, 34, 42, 128;—VIII, 28 (two), 29 (two), 61, 81 (two), 84, 88;—XI, 17;—XIII, 14, 46, 59;—XV, 129 (*ὁ γαμβρός*, i. e. "Ἄδωνις, l. 128),⁴ 148;—XIX, 5 (*τὰν ὀδύναν*, implied in *κέντασσε*, l. 1.);—XXI, 4 (*τὸν ὕπνον*, after *κᾶν ὀλίγον νυκτός τις ἐπιμύσσησι*: "the little sleep he does snatch."), 14 (*τοῖς ἀλιεύσιν*), 20, 26 (*ὁ καιρός*, i. e. *τὸ καλὸν θέρος*) 46, 47 (two), 50, 52, 53 (*τῷ χρυσῷ*, with anaphora to: *ἀνείλκυσα χρύσειον ἰχθύν*. Cf. *χρυσόν*, l. 57, "some gold," and *τῷ χρυσῷ* again, l. 60, with

¹Synt., p. 29, 5.

²Synt., p. 26, 12.

³To this Ostermann [Jahnii Ann. l. c.] notes, "jener Greis, wie der Artikel oft bei den Alexandrinern demonstrative Bedeutung hat." This note is quoted (ad loc.) by Fritzsche, and Hiller refers to Krueger, II, 50, 3, 4, where the Homeric use of the article in such cases is referred to. As a matter of fact Attic Greek would have nothing else here but *ὁ πρέσβυς*, and it is scarcely conceivable that an Alexandrian should interpret the article here differently from an Attic writer. The mere fact that epic influence can be seen in the present passage is not sufficient to force an Homeric emphasis upon the article.

⁴Cholmeley's comparison with *ὁ στρατιώτας* of XIV, 56 is pointless, unless he intends *ὁ γαμβρός* to be taken in apposition with "Ἄδωνις.

anaphora.), 56, 57 (τὰγκίστρια), 60, 66 (τῶν ὑπνῶν, the dream just related.—XXIII, 7 (τῶν πυρσῶν, implied in πολύφιλτρος, ἤρατο, l. 1, φιλέοντα, l. 3, τὸν Ἑρωτα, l. 4), 11, 39, 51, 52, 53, 60 (τῷγαλμα, of Eros, τὸν θεόν, l. 58), 63.—The next seven examples are from epic idylls: XXIV, 103, 133;—XXV, 1, 51, 64, 71, 84;—XXVII, 2, 5 (τὸ φίλαμα).—Epigram v (XIII), 1. (τὴν θεόν).

3. *With objects present to the mind*, that is, objects that are referred to simply as known, either from previous experience or general report. Here the anaphoric power of the article has its widest scope. Minute analysis of this type of anaphora into subsidiary categories would be unprofitable. It is sufficient and convenient to group under a few principal heads cases that are approximately alike.¹ So we may consider together (1) *things that are set down as known or notorious*, including the ἀναφορὰ κατ' ἐξοχὴν of Apollonius, (2) *things that are customary, proper, requisite, desirable*, (3) *things that are known and referred to in their relation to a person or thing previously mentioned or implied*—the so-called *possessive use* of the article. Under the present category, then, are included those cases that come under the first of these three divisions. They are the following: I, 6, 9 (τὰν οἶδα), 11, 82 (ἀ κῶρα—Priapus pretends to know her), 105 (ὁ βουκόλος), 152;—II, 74;—III, 4 (two), 29 (two), 40, 43 (two);—IV, 4 (two), 35, 36 (ταὶ δὲ γυναῖκες), 37, 58, 61;—V, 12 (τὰν αἶγα), 42, 97, 123 (τὰν κυκλάμινον), 133 (τὰν φάσσαν), 135;—VI, 45;—VII, 67, 78, 136 ff. (τὸ . . . ὕδωρ, τοὶ . . . τέττιγες, ἃ δ' ὀλολυγών), 145 (τοὶ ὄρπακες)²—VIII, 87;—X, 15, 21, 44, 54, 55;—XI, 12;—XIII, 6, 7 (τὰν πλοκαμίδα, with which Hylas is usually pictured),³ 16;—XV, 7, 24, 37 (τοῖς δ' ἔργοις), 43 (two), 52, 63, 77 (τὰν νόον, quoting a proverb or custom), 98;—XIX, 8;—XXI, 31 (τὰν ἄγραν, the daily catch), 36;—XXIX, 37;—XXX, 29;—Epigram,

¹ See Krueger, I, 50, 2, 4.

² In this description of a scene witnessed in the past, and now recalled, the article is virtually a deixis transferred to the past. In the same lines the article is also freely omitted with other objects.

³ Theocritus may have had a picture of the boy in mind. Cf. Wilamowitz, Textg., p. 175, n., and Naber, Mnem. xxxiv, (1906), p. 169.

VI (xx), 6. Cases occur where the article is used with a noun whose identity is first explained in the following words. The mind of the speaker anticipates his speech and lets the article point forward to the definition that is to follow. This definition usually takes the form of a relative clause.¹ In Theocritus we note the following: III, 21, τὸν στέφανον . . . τὸν . . . φυλάσσω;—IV, 28, 40;—XXII, 64;—XXIII, 58;—XXV, 211. Once we find the article pointing forward to infinitives: XVI, 60, ὁ μόχθος . . . μετρεῖν . . . νίζειν . . . παρελθεῖν. The article is used with similar prolepsis, but without a following relative clause or equivalent, in Epigram, VIII (xvii), 1. Ἄ τε φωνὰ Δώριος χώνηρ ὁ τὰν κωμφοδίαν | εὐρὼν Ἐπίχαρμος. Ἄ φωνὰ is defined only when we reach τὰν κωμφοδίαν.

4. *With things that are marked as customary, proper, etc.* Tho this use of the article is merely a subdivision of the previous category, as was said above, it is given a separate paragraph for convenience. The same is true of the following division.

II, 1, ταὶ δάφναι, τὰ φίλτρα, 2, τὰν κελέβαν, the ingredients and implement for preparing the love charm in the mystic rite about to begin; 33, τὰ πίτυρα, the husks essential to such rites.—VIII, 86, τὰ δίδακτρα, the requisite pay for instruction (l. 85).—XI, 17 τὸ φάρμακον, the proper remedy, with anaphora also to line 1 ff.—XIV, 52, τὸ φάρμακον.—XXII, 64, ὁ μισθός, the required pay; anticipating the relative clause ᾧ κέν σε πίθουμιν.—XXIII, 24, τὸ φάρμακον . . . τὸ λᾶθος, in both cases "the longed for," and τὸ λᾶθος may be looked upon as an appositive to τὸ φάρμακον; 38, βραχὺ κλαῦσον, ἐπισπείσας δὲ τὸ δάκρυ. Fritzsche aptly compares Horace, Od. II, 6, 23: "*debita* sparges lacrima favillam"; but the article also refers to the δάκρυ implied in κλαῦσον, and so Lang renders, "weep a little; and when thou hast made this libation of thy tears."

5. *The article with possessive value.* This use of the article seems to have belonged to the early language, and if some of the examples formerly cited for Homer have been replaced by conjecture with forms of the personal and possessive pronouns,² it seems

¹ Krueger, I, 50, 2, 7.

² See Vogrinz, p. 194.

impossible to deny it to Homer altogether.¹ Here, as in other uses of the Greek article, the failure of our own definite article may cause overtranslation, whereby the Greek article is unduly emphasized. The Greek grammarians themselves, as we have seen, made no special provisions for this use of the article apart from the general head under which it really belongs, namely *ἀναφορά*.² The definite article in modern English may also be used in this way, but we are restricted to a few old combinations. We may render < *με* > *τῶν ὧτων καθελούσα* (*Id.* v, 133), "taking me by the ears," and, "I have a pain in the head" is perfectly intelligible for *ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν* (*Id.* III, 52); but our article fails us when we try to translate *δὸς τὰν χέρα μοι* (*Id.* xv, 66), and we resort to the possessive. Even the Greek article at a later period no longer sufficed to indicate possessive relations.³ When the article is used in this sense, it is of course necessary in order to avoid ambiguity, that the possessor be known, and consequently, in most cases, the person of the possessor is directly indicated in the preceding context, most frequently as subject or object of the verb, or as a dative of interest.⁴ No cases are cited below from epic idylls. In the other idylls, particularly the Doric, the article appears freely in this function, especially with names of parts of the body, articles of dress, and nouns of relationship. With parts of the body the possessive article has been noted in thirty-nine (39) cases, its omission in forty-six (46), of which twenty-one (21) are prepositional phrases, and a number of others formulae like *ποσσὶ χορεύσαι, πόδας ἔλκεις, χεῖρὸς ἐφανταμένα*. It may be of interest also to note that the possessive article is rare in narrative portions. Dialogue furnishes most of the examples, for here there is least danger of ambiguity.

a. *With parts of the body*: *ἄμφην* (Aeol. = *αὐχὴν*) xxx, 28;—*γαστήρ* xxi, 41;—*γένειον* vi, 36, xx, 8;—*γένυς* xxix, 33;—*δάκτυλος* viii, 23;—*κεφάλῃ* iii, 52, xi, 70, xx, 12, xxi, 13;—*κραδία* xxiii, 34;—*κρόταφος* xi, 9;—*μέτωπον* xx, 24;⁵—*μυελός*

¹ See Foerstemann, p. 28.

² Compare above, *Introd.*

³ See Völker, o. c., p. 7, and footnote 5.

⁴ Cf. Foerstemann, l. c.

⁵ (*έμοι*) *λευκὸν τὸ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι λάμπε μελαίναις*. In the same self-description we find without the article *ὑπήναν, χαῖται, περὶ κροτάφοισι, ἐπ' ὀφρύσι, ὄμματα*, but *τὸ στόμα*, and again *ἐκ στομάτων, φωνά*.

xxx, 21 ;—*ὀδοὺς* vi, 37 ;—*ῥμμα* v, 36 ;—*ῥνυξ* iv, 54 ;—*ὀπλά* iv, 36 ;—*οὐθαρ* viii, 69 ;—*οὐς* (*ὦς*) v, 133 ;—*ὀφθαλμός* xi, 53 ;—*παραύα* xxx, 5 (?) ;—*πούς* xx, 12 ; xxx, 3 (?) ;—*πρόσωπον* ii, 140 ; xxiii, 13 ;—*πῶγων* x, 40 ;—*στόμα* i, 146 ; viii, 82 ; xi, 9, 56 ; xx, 26 (v. l. *καὶ στόμα*) ; xxi, 57 ;—*σφυρόν* iv, 51 ;—*χείρ* x, 55 ; xv, 66 ; xxi, 9, 48 ; xxvii, 18.

The following group of words, used with the possessive article, tho not to be classed as parts of the body, may best be treated here: *γνώμη*, in the sense of "mind" or "judgment" xxi, 62, *τὸ δ' ὃ ξένε . . . ἔρειδε τὰν γνῶμαν* ;¹ *ἰδέα* xxx, 14 ;—*κάλλος* ii, 83 ;—*μορφά* xx, 14 ; xxiii, 2 ;—*νόος*, xxi, 32.²—*πνεῦμα* "breath" viii, 76 ;³—*σθένος* i, 44 ;—*τρόπος*, "character, disposition ;" x, 37 ; xxiii, 2 ;—*φρήν* ii, 19 ; xi, 72 ;—*φωνά* x, 37 ;—*ψυχά* xi, 52 ; xv, 4,⁴ 37 ; xxiii, 55 ; xxvii, 61.

b. As with parts of the body, so *with articles of dress*: ii, 53, 156 ; iii, 25 ; v, 15 ; xv, 21 (two), 39 (two) ; xxvii, 54.

c. *With nouns of relationship*. Where the reference is clear the article may be omitted. The nouns then approach the value of proper names and are similarly treated.⁵ In Theocritus Attic usage is generally followed. The proportion of omissions of the possessive article with this class of nouns is not large in Doric idylls. Following are the cases where the article in the possessive

¹Hiller explains: "firma mentem meam," and similarly Wuestemann and Hartung. Kiessling however (cf. Cholmeley, and Lang's translation) renders: "iam animum intende, scil. ut somnum recte interpreteris." Aside from other considerations, since *τὰν* follows the imperative *τὸ . . . ἔρειδε*, it is natural to understand it as referring to the subject, that is "your." For the possessive article similarly used after an imperative, with reference to the subject compare x, 55 ; xv, 21, 66 ; xxvii, 18. In two cases, iii, 3, and viii, 63, where the reference is not to the subject of the imperative but to the speaker, there is no ambiguity, because the context in each case decides.

²*εἴ γὰρ ἂν εἰκάξαις κατὰ τὸν νόον*. Whatever the true reading of this troublesome line, *τὸν νόον* is "the mind" of the subject of the verb. The same phrase is elsewhere anarthrous with or without a possessive pronoun.

³*Ἀδεῖ' ἃ φωνά τὰς πόρτιος, ἀδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα*. The presence of *τὰς πόρτιος* and its own position indicate that *τὸ πνεῦμα* is "her breath." Fritzsche's objection to this interpretation, 'obstat connexus versus sequentis,' would have to be applied as well to the preceding words. He interprets *τὸ πνεῦμα*, 'aër spiritu motus.'

⁴*ὃ τὰς ἀλεμάτω ψυχὰς*. See Wilamowitz, *Textgeschichte*, p. 48, note 1.

⁵See Krueger, 50, iii, 3, A. 8. Kuehner, § 462, d.

sense is prefixed: *μάτηρ* IV, 9; VIII, 16; X, 58; XI, 54, 67; XIX, 7;—*πατήρ* VIII, 20;—*τεκόν* (which had become thoroughly substantivized and was treated as a real noun) XV, 47. Here we may put also *δεσπότης* V, 10 and *δούλα* II, 94. In XV, 148 *χώνηρ* is not "my husband" but, with anaphora to *Διοκλείδας*, "that man."

Outside the sphere of words above enumerated, Theocritus is free in the use of the article with possessive value. The identity of the possessor is usually clear from the context. Cases occur, however, especially in dialogue, where the possessor is not directly indicated to the reader. This is the more common in dialogue, because the reference was at once clear to the listener, and the possessor need not be indicated to him with such exactness. The examples need simply be listed. They are the following: I, 14, 62, 87, 120, 121; II, 64, 127; III, 3, 7; IV, 13, 26, 28; V, 28, 85, 87, 88, 89, 96, 105, 107, 127;¹ VI, 2, 6, 9, 10, 21, 29; VII, 65, 87;² VIII, 35, 63, 70, 72, 73; X, 2 (?), 3, 6, 34; XI, 12, 39, 44, 74, 80; XII, 20, 23; XV, 55, 130; XX, 28, 40, 42, 44; XXI, 14 (twice), 27, 33, 67;³ XXIII, 13, 18 (*τὸν φλιάν*, "its doorpost" with reference to *μελάβροισ*); XXVII, 33, 37⁴; XXVIII, 23.

6. *The article with proper names.* a. *With names of persons.* Few chapters in the study of the Greek article have caused more difficulty than that of articular proper names, and especially names of persons. Recent years have seen the publication of a number of important contributions in this special field, which are devoted to the examination of individual authors and departments. Important data have been brought to light which contribute to an

¹ *ἡ παῖς* . . . *τῇ κάλπιδι*. "my girl." So Fritzsche, noting: "*alii minus apte puellas in universum articulo significari existimant.*"—*τῇ κάλπιδι* is "her pitcher."

² *τὰς καλὰς αἰγας*. Cf. schol.: *τὰς καλὰς σου αἰγας*.

³ *καὶ τοῖς χρυσοῖσιν ὀνείροις*. *Kal τοῖς* is Scaliger's correction (ap. Ameis, p. 16) for the vulg. *καίτοι*. Hermann (ap. Fritzsche) wrote *καὶ σοῖς*, and so Fritzsche and Hiller. The article is desirable not only with possessive meaning, but also with anaphora, "those golden dreams of yours."

⁴ *τὰ δὲ πῶσα καλὰ νομῶ*. The reference of *τὰ* is ambiguous. With *νομῶ* in the present it is best taken "my flocks," with *καλὰ* adverbial as in l. 47.

understanding of the sphere of the articular proper name, and consequently, of the stylistic effect of its free employment.¹

The sphere and effect of the articular proper noun have been stated in their general aspect by Professor Gildersleeve in the *American Journal of Philology*, XI, 483 ff. The facts to be noted are the following. We know that classical Greek poetry outside of comedy had little use for the articular proper name. It is excluded from Homer and rare in lyric poetry—the sole instance in Pindar (Pythia, x, 57) being accounted an excusable Dorism.² In tragedy it is so rare that Valckenaer³ was led to deny its use in that department. In Aristophanes there is a freer use, so that, tho the lyric choruses admit articular proper names of persons in only two places (Lys. 1213, Ran. 422), according to Fuller,⁴ in dialogue they are by no means rare. In prose, Plato leads with the freest use of articular proper names. He is followed by the historians, while the orators, restricted by official speech, stand last. The meaning of all this can be nothing else, than that the sphere of the articular proper name is to be sought in those departments and authors that approach the speech of everyday life. The home of the articular proper name is familiar language, and its tone, therefore, where it is freely used, is familiar. The mere fact that the article regularly accompanies proper names in modern Greek is itself an indication of this, for it is in the popular usage of the earlier language that the origin of modern uses is to be sought.

In Theocritus it is necessary to distinguish again between the epic (Ionic), and Doric (bucolic) idylls. In the former Theocritus

¹ In the domain of prose, L. Herbst, *Philologus* XI, 374 ff., for Thucydides (see A. J. P. II. 541); Fr. Blass, *Rh. M.* XLIV, 1 ff. (see A. J. P. XI, 107), for Demosthenes; C. Schmidt, "De articulo in nominibus propriis apud Atticos scriptores pedestres," Kiel, 1890 (see A. J. P. XI, 484, note); H. Kallenberg, in two studies, Part I, *Philol.* XLIX (N. F. III) 1890, 515 ff., "Der Artikel bei Namen von Ländern, Städten und Meeren in der griechischen Prosa," II, Berlin Program 1891, "Der Artikel bei I, Flussnamen und II, Gebirgsnamen;" and Ad. Zucker, Nürnberg Pr. 1899, for Xenophon's *Anabasis*. In poetry there is the study of Uckermann, "Der Artikel bei Eigennamen in den Komödien des Aristophanes," Berlin Pr. 1892, which has remained uncompleted.

² Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve, ad loc.

³ In a note to Euripides, *Phoen.* 147.

⁴ Diss., p. 35.

in general closely follows his model, and admits the article with names of persons only in the following instances: 1) with an attribute, XIII, 7 (not in the epyllion proper); XVII, 26; XXII, 34, 140; XXVI, 1;¹ XII, 35 (Ionic lyric); and 2) with national appellatives, XXIV, 1, ἁ Μιδεᾶτις, Ἀλκμήνα; XII, 14, ὁ Θεσσαλός, generic; XXV, 180, οὐξ Ἐλίκηθεν Ἀχαιός, with anaphora. This is a total of nine cases against one hundred and fifty-one, where the article is omitted (vocatives and predicates not being counted). The Aeolic (lyric) group shows but one articular name of a person, with an attributive (XXVIII, 17), against five without the article.² In the Doric idylls the situation is different. There Theocritus approximates the familiar language of the naïve shepherd, and we find articular proper names of persons used with considerable freedom. Taking the Doric group as a whole, we find sixty-eight proper names of persons with the article, one hundred and eighty without the article, or 27.41 % articular. With the Doric idylls it is interesting to compare the mimes of Herondas. A single careful count covering the first seven mimes showed eighty-five anarthrous names of persons, and twenty-two in articular combinations, or 20.5 % articular. Of these twenty-two, nine are of the type ὁ Ματακίως τῆς Πατακίου Ψύλλος, where the proper name stands rather in appositional relation to the elliptical phrase ὁ (ῆ) + genitive; and four others are national appellatives. It is evident then, that in Herondas the articular proper name is less frequent than in the Doric idylls of Theocritus. In the epigrams included in this study no articular names of persons occur.

Ameis (p. 14 f.) in discussing the articular proper name in Theocritus simply accepts for our author the rule posited by Hermann:³ "Nimirum ut articulus apponatur ad illud nomen, quod aut loquenti vel ei quicum is loquitur in animo versatur, aut fama et sermonibus hominum celebratum est"—the familiar anaphora,—and remarks, p. 23, "Nominibus propriis saepe vix

¹ In each of these cases strict epic interpretation makes the article demonstrative.

² For names of divinities see below.

³ Euripides, Iphig. Aul., praef., p. xvii.

ullo discrimine additur et adimitur." That anaphora does play a part is true, and the categories "the famous," "the aforesaid," etc., may in some cases be applied, but no law can be laid down which will categorically explain Theocritean usage. It lies wholly within the poet's choice, whether or not he shall use the article, and the metre may in some cases be the deciding element. The best that can be said is that where the article is used, the tone is generally that of familiar reference to persons either belonging to the small circle, rural or urban, in which the speaker moves, or familiarly known to the speaking characters by current report, or homely legend and superstition.

The occurrences will be taken up by idylls, and the first to be considered are those unaccompanied by attributives.

Id. I, 100, *χὼ Δάφνις ποταμείβετο*. *Δάφνις*, the subject of this shepherd song, "*τα Δάφνιδος ἄλγεια*," occurs but once more in this idyl with the article, line 140. The name occurs eight times (exclusive of vocatives) without the article: l. 19 in the title "*τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγεια*"; at the beginning of the song, l. 66; as predicate, 120, 121; in apposition, 113, 116; and where Daphnis speaks of himself in the third person, 103, 135.—I, 109, *ὠραίος χῶδωνις*. This is the only mention of Adonis in the idyl, and the line is open to question. Anchises, another favorite of Aphrodite is mentioned in line 106 without the article. Both were familiar figures in shepherd lore and might with equal propriety have the article. The article with *Ἄδωνις* may be contemptuous. Besides the nine anarthrous forms already quoted for this idyl we find *Θύρσιος* (65) and *Διομήδεος* (112).

Id. III, 1. *τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα*, the Amaryllis of the speaker's dreams and hopes, almost "my Amaryllis."—2. *ὁ Τίτυρος*.—41, *ἀ δ' Ἀταλάντα*, 47, *ᾧδωνις*. In these lines (40 to 51) five mythological parallels are related. In the first we find *Ἴππομένης* (40) without the article, *Ἀταλάντα* with the article in a contrast; in the second *Μελάμποις* (43), itself anarthrous, is preceded by the apposition *ὁ μάντις*, while Pero is described as *ἀ δὲ . . . μᾶτηρ ἀ χαρίεσσα περίφρονος Ἀλφειβοίης* (44/45); in the third parallel we find *Ἄδωνις* with the article (47). The formula "the famous," "storied," etc., might do for *ἀ δ' Ἀταλάντα* and *ὁ Ἄδωνις*, but

we have the equally well known Ἴππομένης, Μελάμπους and Ἀλφειβοίης, as well as Βίαντος (44) and Ἰασίωνα (50) without the article.

Id. iv, 21, τῷ Λαμπριάδα.—*Id.* v, 88. ἡ Κλεαρίστα, the only mention of her name in the idyl.—90 ὁ Κρατίδας. In both cases a possessive translation will approximate the tone of the article.—*Id.* vi, 6. βάλλει τοι Πολύφαιμον τὸ ποιμένιον ἡ Γαλάτεια | μάλοισιν. In this as in the other Polyphemus idyl, Γαλάτεια always has the article except xi, 76, Γαλάτειαν . . . ἄλλαν, "another Galatea."—42. τὸν Δάφνιν ὁ Δαμοίτας ἐφίλησε. Elsewhere in the idyl these names are anarthrous (ll. 1, 5, 20, 44) save Δάφνις once, l. 1, where it has the appositive ὁ βουκόλος added.—*Id.* vii, 55. τὸν Λυκίδαν, "hunc hominem, me, Lycidan," (Fritzsche)—but this is the only passage in which the name of the person thus used for the speaker himself has the article.¹—72. ὁ δὲ Τίτυρος.² 73. τᾶς Ξενέας, her namely of the familiar Daphnis legend, (v. l. ξενίας p. s., ξανθᾶς v. l. in schol.).—*Id.* viii, 8. χῶ Δάφνις. Except here and verse 1, where we have Δάφνιδι τᾷ χαρίεντι, this name is anarthrous throughout the idyl (5, 31, 36, 38 = ἐγώ, 71, 92) and the name of the other shepherd, Μενάλκας never has the article (2, 5, 30, 32, 33 = ἐγώ, 39, 62). In line 8 we have a contrast, but we have contrast as well in other cases where the article does not appear, so, 5, 31, 71. Daphnis is referred to familiarly with the article, and of the two singers he was the more widely known and more famous (v. 92).³ *Id.* xi. 8. τᾶς Γαλατείας. 13. τὰν Γαλάτειαν—"that Galatea of his," cf. to vi, 6, above.—*Id.* xiv, 31. ἡ δὲ Κυνίσκα | ἔκλαεν. It is her lover who is speaking. He has previously referred to her as ἡ χαρίεσσα Κυνίσκα (8) and ἡ δέ (21). Here the noun stands in a strong contrast and ἡ δέ is almost demonstrative.—Other articular names in this idyl are proper adjectives, and names accompanied by attributives. It may be noted that of the twelve anarthrous names nine occur in the long speech of Aeschines.—*Id.* xv, 23. τὸν

¹ Compare for anarthrous forms, i, 103; v, 9, 14, 86, (Δάκων), 19, 70, 150, (Κομάτας); vii, 96; viii, 33, 38.

² See Wilamowitz, Textg., p. 165.

³ Cf. Leutsch, Philol. Anz. ii, 515. Wilamowitz, Textg., p. 234.

"Αδωνι, here "the Adonis," *i. e.* the spectacle, celebration. Of the ten occurrences of this name in Theocritus (exclusive of four vocatives), seven in this idyl, and I, 109; III, 47; XX, 35, there is but one lacking the article, namely line 111 of this idyl. The other occurrences of the name in *Id.* xv follow: 96, τὸν Ἀδωνι αἰεῖδεν, "the Adonis song"; 102. οἶόν τοι τὸν Ἀδωνι . . . ἄγαγον ὦραι—"thy (Aphrodite's l. 101) Adonis here." A statue of Adonis was set up at this festival (ll. 127–128, Bekker, Charikles, I, p. 101). But this fact will not account for the article, tho names of statues regularly take the article in Attic prose (Schmidt, p. 16), for Κύπρις, also represented by a statue (l. 128), is without the article in both places where it occurs (128, 131).—Elsewhere in the idyl Ἀδωνις, with the article, is accompanied by attributives.—92. Κορίνθια εἰμὲς ἄνωθεν, | ὥς καὶ ὁ Βελλεροφῶν, Bellerophon whom the Corinthians chose as their special hero.—*Id.* XX, 35. καὶ τὸν Ἀδωνι . . . φίλησεν (*s. c.* Κύπρις), (vv. ll. αὐτόν vulg., Fritzsche, cett.; καὶ τόν Ahrens, Hiller, Cholmeley; οὐ τόν, Wilamowitz). Compare *Id.* xv, above. Anarthrous are Εὐνείκα, I, 42, and Ἐνδυμίων, 37.

A few cases follow where the article is used with proper adjectives to refer to persons: II, 96, ὁ Μύνδιος; XII, 14, ὁ Θεσσαλός, generic, as ὁ Ἀμυκλαϊάζων, l. 13; xiv, 12, 30; xv, 97. In VII, 71 where the article is omitted with a national appellative in the singular, Ἀχαρνεὺς was probably the man's name. In other cases the proper adjective with the article stands in apposition with the name of the person: II, 29; v, 2, 72, 73; xxiv, 1; or with an attributive added, xxv, 180, οὐξ Ἐλίκηθεν Ἀχαιός (with anaphora, referring to l. 165).

Cases where the proper name with the article is attended by an appositional noun are comparatively rare. When the proper name precedes, it is set down as well-known and the apposition is added with little emphasis:¹ III, 31, ἡ Γραιὼ . . . κοσκινόμαντις.²—v,

¹ See Kuehner, § 462, A. Anm. 1.

² For this troublesome line see Wilamowitz, Textg. p. 135, where the Ἀγροῖα reading of the mss. is plausibly defended. In the reading given above, the addition of the anarthrous κοσκινόμαντις after the intervening τάλαθέα finds no parallel in Theocritus, tho Hiller cites *Iliad*, I, 11, τὸν Χρόσην ἡτίμησ' ἀρηγήρα.

2, τῆνον τὸν ποιμένα τὸν Συβαρίταν | τὸν Λάκωνα, 62, ὁ βουκόλος ᾧδ' ὁ Λυκώπας (v. l. ᾧδε), 143, τῷ Λάκωνος τῷ ποιμένος.—VI, 1, Δαμοίτας χῶ Δάφνις ὁ βουκόλος,¹ 23, ὁ μάντις ὁ Τήλεμος, contemptuous, "that fakir prophet"—cf. Odyssey IX, 509. In the following cases attributives also occur: VII, 152, τῆνον τὸν ποιμένα τὸν ποτ' Ἀνάπφ | τὸν κρατερὸν Πολύφαμον; compare XI, 7, ὁ Κύκλωψ ὁ παρ' αἰνῖν | ὄρχαῖος Πολύφαμος, both passages notable for the heaping of articles.—XIII, 7, παιδός | τοῦ χαρίεντος Ὑλα. —For articular proper names in the nominative in apposition with an expressed or implied vocative see below under "article with nouns in apposition with pronouns." The proper names so used are names of animals.

With proper names of persons, accompanied by an attributive the article is used with considerable regularity in the Doric idylls. Of thirty-two cases where the article is omitted, twenty-seven occur in epic idylls. The first attributive position is the most common (26 cases), far behind follows the third (6 cases), and last stands the second (4 cases). Four instances of the first position are found in epic idylls, and one of the third position.

First attributive position: II, 102-103, ἄγαγε τὸν λιπαρόχρων | εἰς ἐμὰ δώματα Δέλφιν,² 115; III, 32; V, 4; VI, 40; VII, 39, 118, 152; VIII, 47; X, 41; XI, 8; XII, 35; XIII, 7 (in the introduction, not the epyllion proper where, excepting Ὑλας ὁ ξανθός, l. 36, proper names of persons are anarthrous); XIV, 8, 30; XV, 86, 128; XVII, 26, (epic); XVIII, 5, 28, 31;³ XXII, 34, 140, (epic); XXVI, 1, (epic); XXVII, 1, τὰν πινυτὰν Ἑλένα, the only articular name of a person in the idyl; XXVIII, 17.

¹ Here as in v, 62; XIII, 5, (Ἀμφιτρώωνος) and xv, 83, (ἄνθρωπος), Wilamowitz, in his edition, prefers the readings without the article. Pairs in which the first name is anarthrous, while the second, always with an attributive or apposition, has the article, are found elsewhere in Theocritus: VII, 132; XXII, 34, 140; XXVI, 1, and similarly in the (spurious) epigram XI (III), 3.

² This is the only place in the idyl where Δέλφιν is articular, tho l. 29 we do find the name in apposition with ὁ Μύνδιος. Most of the occurrences of the name are in the ritualistic chant of the girl (21, 23 (twice), 26, 29, 50, 53, 62) and the rest in the address to Selene (narrative) (77, 149).

³ Elsewhere in the idyl Ἑλένα, without an attributive, is anarthrous (25, 37, 48) as Μερτιάδω, also (l. 1).

Second attributive position: III, 35; v, 147; VII, 98; xv, 127.

Third attributive position. An attributive added to a proper name in this position has more often the value of an apposition, added loosely as an afterthought. The occurrences follow: VII, 105; VIII, 1; XII, 29; XIII, 36; xx, 43. So also once the name of a divinity, II, 148.

In only five cases the article is used with the genitive of a proper name depending upon a noun of relationship, expressed or understood: II, 66, ἃ τῶν βούλοιο . . . Ἀναξώ. IV, 21, τοὶ τῷ Λαμπριάδα, τοὶ δαμόται. xv, 97, ἃ τᾶς Ἀργείας θυγάτηρ; with names of divinities: Epigram, II (VII), 1; VI (xx), 1.

b. *With names of divinities.* In the case of names of divinities Theocritus shows much the same latitude in the use of the article as in the case of personal names. In fact, even excluding oaths, the proportion of articular names of divinities is greater than that of articular names of persons. In the epic idylls the article is generally excluded, as we expect. Four cases occur in epic idylls, where the article is used, but of these, two in XIII are not in the epyllion proper (II. 1 and 11), while the other two stand together (xxvi, 6), in a contrast. The Aeolic group furnishes two examples, both forms of Ἔρως (xxix, 22; xxx, 25), and in the epigrams considered, four such articular names are found. In the Doric group of idylls the article is prefixed to names of divinities with great frequency. Of the hundred and fourteen names (excluding oaths which will be treated below) forty-two, or 36.8 per cent. have the article. The Nymphs of wood and water, the Muses, patrons of shepherd minstrelsy, Eros and Aphrodite, themes of many a shepherd song, are the divinities that figure most prominently in the list. We may believe that statues of Nymphs, of Priapus, Pan and Dionysus were a common sight in the groves where many of the pastoral scenes are laid. And so these rural divinities were felt as ever present, even as their statues—and statues, when named, regularly have the article. One of the common cases in which the article is used is after verbs of sacrifice and analogous expressions. (The alphabetical arrangement is for convenience.)

Ἀμφιτρίτη: XXI, 55—Ἀπόλλων: v, 82; anarthrous in epics. Φοῖβος and Φ. Ἀπόλλων anarthrous, VII, 101; XVII, 67; Παιάν, articular, epigram II (VII), 1.—Ἀφροδίτα: II, 7; x, 33; XIX, 4; anarthrous four times in Doric idylls. Κύπρις, articular five out of thirteen times: I, 95, 105; II, 130, 131. Epigram v, (XIII), 1, on a statue of the goddess. Κυπρογένεια anarthrous, XXX, 31. Παφία articular: XXVII, 14, 15, 55. Κυθήρεια articular: III, 46; XXIII, 16.—Ἀώς: II, 148; XIII, 11; anarthrous XXVIII, 26 (?).—Δηώ: VII, 3. Δαμάτηρ anarthrous, VII, 32, 155.—Διόνυσος: XX, 33 (?); XXVI, 6; τὸς τρεῖς (sc. βωμούς) τῇ Σεμέλῃ, τὸς ἐννέα τῇ Διονύσῳ; anarthrous, XXVI, 9, 27, 33, 37 (epic).—Ἐκάτα: II, 12.—Ἔρως: I, 97; τὸν Ἔρωτα, spoken by his mother (but l. 98: Ἔρωτος . . . ἀργαλέω). II, 7, ὃ τ' Ἔρως, with a touch of bitterness. III, 15, τὸν Ἔρωτα; the disappointed lover speaks. x, 20, ὠφρόντιστος Ἔρως, again a lover speaking.—XIII, 1; XXIII, 4; XXVII, 19; XXIX, 22; XXX, 25. Anarthrous as proper noun Ἔρως occurs eight times.—Ζεὺς: IV, 43, the sky-god; epigram, VI (XX), 1; anarthrous thirty-seven times, twenty-five of these in epic idylls.—Ἥρα: IV, 22; anarthrous three times, once in Doric.—Μοῖσαι: I, 9, 20, τὰς βουκολικὰς Μοῖσας, 144; v, 80; IX, 32, ἡ Μοῖσα καὶ ῥῥά, "my muse;" XI, 6; anarthrous sixteen times, seven of these in epic, one in epigram, and six in *Id.* VII. Πιερίδες, with the article XI, 3. In epigram I, 2, we find ταῖς Ἑλικωνιάσι.—Νύμφαι: v, 12, 54, 140, 149. In this idyl statues of nymphs may have been part of the setting.¹ Νύμφαι (Νύμφα, VIII, 93), is anarthrous four times in Doric idylls (excluding vocatives and oaths). In I, 22, we find τὰν Κραναιᾶν, with reference to a statue.—Πάν: I, 16; v, 58. Besides these two occurrences Πάν is articular seven times in oaths, for which see below. It is anarthrous but twice: I, 3, μετὰ Πᾶνα, and IV, 63, in the plural.—Πλούτος: x, 19, αὐτὸς ὁ Π. (αὐτός = "alone").—Πρίηπος: I, 21, (a statue), 81, ἦνθ' ὁ Π.; the speaker sits before a statue of the god.—Πρωτεύς: VIII, 52 (?).—Σεμέλα: XXVI, 6, (see above under Διόνυσος); anarthrous XXVI, 35.²

¹ See Wuestemann, to l. 17, and cf. Fritzsche.

² Of the names of divinities used with the article, nine are accompanied by an

*Names of divinities in oaths.*¹ 1. Ποτί with the genitive. In Theocritus (and the other bucolic poets, see Ameis, p. 37) the noun in this form of oath always has the article, tho in comedy it is sometimes, in tragedy always, anarthrous (Krueger, I, 68, 37, 2): I, 12; IV, 50; V, 74; XV, 70. So once with ναί ποτί, in V, 70.

2. Ναί with the accusative. In this common form the name is anarthrous twice, once with a common noun in an epic idyl, XXIV, 73, *ναί γάρ ἐμὸν γλυκὺ φέγγος*, and *ναί Μοίρας*, II, 160. In the following cases the article is used: II, 118; IV, 47; V, 141; VI, 21; XV, 14; XXVII, 20, 50.

3. Οὐ and οὐ μά with the accusative. In four cases the noun is anarthrous: IV, 17, 29; VII, 39; XI, 29. It is articular in V, 14, 17; XXVII, 35. Once a common noun is used: VI, 22, *κοῦ μ' ἔλαθ', οὐ τὸν ἐμὸν τὸν ἕνα γλυκύν, ᾧ περ ὄρημι*.²

c. *Names of peoples in the plural.* Theocritus in general observes the rule, according to which they are anarthrous. Of the forty-seven occurrences of names of this class (only nine in Doric idylls) only two have the article: XV, 93. *Πελοποννασιστὶ λαλεῦμες · | δωρίσδεν δ' ἔξεστι, δοκῶ, τοῖς Δωριέεσσι*, 'we are Corinthians (Dorians, l. 91), and who may speak Dorian if not (we) the Dorians?'—The other case is a patronimic in the plural: XV, 141, *οἱ ἔτι πρότερον Λαπίθαι καὶ Δευκαλῶνες*.

d. *Names of cities* in general do not require the article.³ In Theocritus the article is used only in two passages in Doric idylls: IV, 32, *αἰνέω τάν τε Κρότωνα · καλὰ πόλις · ἃ τε Ζάκυνθος*.—XV, 126, *ἃ Μιλατος ἐρεῖ*. Without the article such names occur

adjective in the first attributive position (I, 20; II, 12; III, 46; X, 20; XI, 6; XIII, 11; XX, 33 (?); XXI, 55; XXX, 25), one with an adjective in the third position (II, 148).

¹ Fuller, p. 74; Ameis, p. 37; Krueger, 50, 5, 9).

² Fritzsche interprets: "nec me latuit, non (latuit) hunc meum unicum dulcem (oculum)," and so most editors. Two passages in Herondas, cited ad loc. by Cholmeley for a different purpose, support the interpretation which makes *οὐ τὸν ἐμὸν κ. τ. ε.* an oath, viz., V, 59, *μὰ τούτους τοὺς δύο*; VI, 23, *μὰ τούτους τοὺς γλυκίας*, sc. *ὀφθαλμούς*. Compare also the oath cited above from the epic XXIV, 73.

³ Kallenberg, Philol., XLIX, 536; Blass, Rh. M., XLIV, 13,

eighteen times in epic, eleven in Doric, and twice in Aeolic idylls.

e. *Names of rivers.* With such names Theocritus uses the article three times, in Doric idylls, in referring to neighboring streams: IV, 24; V, 123 (cf. 124, 'Ιμέρα anarthrous); VII, 1. Names of rivers are anarthrous eighteen times in Doric, nine times in epic, even when ποταμός is added, as in VII, 75, 112.

f. *Names of mountains and promontories.* With names of this class the article is found three times, twice with an attributive: IV, 19; XI, 47; once where the name stands in apposition: IV, 33, τὸ ποταφὸν τὸ Λακίνιον.¹ Names of this class are found without the article seventeen times in Doric, five in epic idylls.

g. *Names of islands* have the article in two instances: I, 125, ἐπὶ νᾶσον τὰν Σικελάν; XV, 126, τὰν Σαμίαν < sc. νᾶσον or γᾶν >. Such names are anarthrous twice in Doric idylls, once in Aeolic with νᾶσος, five times in epic.

h. *Names of countries* are rare in Theocritus and never have the article. Three cases were found in Doric idylls—XIV, 68; XVIII, 20, 'Αχαιίδα γαίαν, 31.

i. *Names of seas* are also rare. Only one example was found in Doric and that in adjective form, with the article: VIII, 56, τὰν Σικελάν τ' ἐς ἄλα. The five instances in epic all stand without the article. Of other bodies of water, a lake is mentioned, XVI, 84, without the article. A spring is mentioned with the article, its name in adjective form: V, 126, ἡ Συβαρίτις < sc. πηγὴ or κρᾶνα >, but elsewhere such names are anarthrous, so: VII, 6, 115; XVI, 102.

k. *Names of vessels and statues*, Attic Greek regularly used with the article.² In Theocritus the 'Αργώ, ship of the Argonauts, is mentioned in the epyllion of *Id.* XIII, without the article, lines 21, 28, 74. In *Id.* XXII, 27, Ἡ μὲν . . . 'Αργώ, the article is substantival. Names of statues with the article have

¹ But here a temple of Hera on the promontory may be meant. Cf. Schol. in cd. Med. 37, Ziegler, "Scholia," p. 100, and for ποταφόν (προσηφόν) of a temple cf. Plut. Themistocles, VIII, 2, 10.

² Schmidt, pp. 16 and 13.

already been spoken of (see above under Νύμφαι and Πρίηπος). In *Id.* xxiii, 58, we find *καὶ ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν ἦλθε, τὸν ὕβρισε*, where a statue of Eros is meant, and in the epigrams, v, (xiii), 1, ἡ Κύπρις; vi, (xx), 58, ὅδ' . . ὦνήρ | . . . Πείσανδρος; viii, (xvii), 1, *χώνηρ ὁ τὰν κωμῳδίαν εὐρὼν Ἐπίχαρμος*, all of which are inscribed on statues of the persons named.

l. *Names of festivals* of the gods are anarthrous in inscriptions of the best period.¹ In Theocritus two such names occur, one with the article: v, 83, (ἔμ' ὠπόλλων φιλέει μέγα) . . . τὰ δὲ Κάρνεα (Apollo's festival) *καὶ δὴ ἐφέρειπει*. The Θαλύσια are mentioned, vii, 3, without the article.

m. *Names of constellations* are anarthrous save in vii, 54: *χώρων*, and here corruption is easy for *κώρων* <Morelius ed., ap. Ahrens>. In the same idyl Ἄρκτος is anarthrous (112). Other names of constellations occur only in epic idylls.

n. *Names of winds* are anarthrous (vii, 53; ix, 11; x, 46), except in one passage: vii, 58, *χάλκυνες στορεσεῦντι . . . | τὸν τε Νότον τὸν τ' Εὐρόν*.

o. Tho not strictly to be classed as proper names, the nouns denoting *natural divisions of time* are by their definite nature akin to proper names and may be treated here conveniently. Here belong primarily the names of the seasons of the year. In Attic² they appear with or without the article, the latter principally in prepositional phrases. In Theocritus *θέρος* alone appears with the article, in Doric idylls: vi, 16; viii, 78; ix, 12; xxi, 23, 26. These nouns are used freely without the article, ten times in Doric idylls, and six times in idylls of the epic group.

Like the seasons may be viewed also the lesser divisions of time, *νύξ* and *ἡμαρ*.³ ἡμαρ is used but once with the article, in the plural: xxi, 23, *ὅσοι τὰς νύκτας ἔφασκον | τῷ θέρεος μινύθειν, ὅτε τᾶματα μακρὰ φέρει Ζεὺς*, where the article is generic. Of the twenty anarthrous forms of this word, eight stand in epic idylls, and of the others, five are used in prepositional phrases.

¹ See Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*,³ p. 228.

² Krueger, i, 50, 2, 12.

³ Krueger, i, 50. 2, 12 and 47, 2, A. 1 and 2.

Νύξ occurs more frequently with the article, twice in the accusative denoting extent (anarthrous once in the plural, II, 86, with δέκα): x, 18; XI, 77. So in comedy the article always accompanies νύκτα in this construction.¹ Other cases of νύξ with the article are: XI, 44 (generic); XXI, 28 ("the present night"); and in the plural, generic, XXI, 22, 25. Νύξ is anarthrous nine times in Doric idylls in expressions of time.

p. Here may be considered also χρόνος, θάλασσα and γῆ, which, like proper names, are definite, and do not require the article, unless a particular time, sea, or land is indicated.² Χρόνος is articular three times: II, 92, ὁ δὲ χρόνος ἄνυτο φεύγων, possibly with anaphora, "that time," "those days of longing."—xiv, 70; xxiii, 28, both times generic, with semipersonification.—Θάλασσα is found with the article: vII, 57 (generic, of the whole sea, cf. Vergil, Ecl., ix, 57)—xi, 43, τὰν γλαυκὰν δὲ θάλασσαν, cf. l. 62, τὸν βυθόν, "that deep of yours." In xxi, 17, ἂ δὲ . . . θάλασσα, the article is substantival. In Doric idylls θάλασσα is twice anarthrous (vi, 27; xi, 49).—Γῆ (γᾶ): xi, 79, ἐν τῇ γᾶ κήγών τις φαίνομαι εἶμεν. Here Ameis (p. 15), and Fritzsche: "in hac terra;" cf. Hiller. But Kiessling better: "Non 'in patria,' sed in terra continenti, quam opponit mari, in quo Galatea, aqua repudiatur, degit." But ἐν γᾶ, "on land," is phraseological, and the article would ordinarily be omitted.—xix, 4, τὰν γᾶν ἐπάταξε, "the ground."—xxx, 3, τὰς γᾶς, "the earth." With definite reference the word is twice anarthrous in Doric idylls (viii, 53; xviii, 20).

r. Βασιλεύς, in the singular, referring to a definite individual, occurs twice in Doric idylls, with the article: xv, 22, 51. Βασίλεια (Βασίλισσα) is used once with the article, xv, 24, with reference to Ptolemy's queen, while in xxvii, 29, τεῇ Βασίλεια is anarthrous in the predicate.

7. *The generic article.*³ With a noun in the singular, the

¹ Fuller, p. 46. Compare also the neuter adverbial expressions τὸ μεσαμβρινόν, etc., i, 15; iv, 3; v, 113, 126; x, 48, and τὸ καῦμα, "aestus per medios," x, 51.

² Kuehner, § 462, l.; Krueger, i, 50, 2, 15.

³ Compare above, introd.

generic article points out an individual as the representative of its class. If the noun used with the generic article is of a nature that it can be used only in the singular, because the only one of its class, the article shows that it is conceived as a whole, complete in all its parts. When the generic article is used with a noun in the plural, all the individuals of the class are taken together and conceived in their relation to one another, as members of the same genus. In all cases there is anaphora in the widest sense of the term, since individuals or classes cannot be designated with the article unless they have previously to some extent come within the experience of the hearer. Hence, in the definition of objects entirely unknown, the article is unnecessary, except in cases where the nature of the substantive, or the need of distinguishing subject and predicate, demands the presence of the article. The exact limitations of the use of the generic article cannot be defined.

Theocritus uses the article with nouns in this sense freely and at times abundantly.—(Cf. *Id.* I, 133 ff. ; VIII, 76 ff. ; IX, 7–8 ; X, 30–31). The fact that it is never obligatory (cf. Gildersleeve, "Problems," p. 122), makes its free employment in the Doric idylls a characteristic of the naïve speech of the characters in these idylls. In Homer the generic article is rare¹ and so we are not surprised to find that it does not occur with nouns in the epic idylls of Theocritus.

a. *With singular nouns.* This is the more common use in Theocritus and occurs as follows: I, 72, 87 ; 132 ff., ἃ δὲ καλὰ νάρκισσος, ἃ πίτυς, ὄλαφος (τὰς κύνας, τοὶ σκῶπες) ; III, 13 ; IV, 16 ; V, 130 ; VI, 7 ; VIII, 76 (2), 79–80, τᾷ δρυὶ (ταὶ βάλανοι), τὰ μαλίδι (μᾶλα), τᾷ βοὶ, ἃ μόσχος, τῷ βουκόλῳ (αἱ βόες) ; IX, 7 (2), 8 (2) ; X, 28 (2), 30–31, ἃ αἰξ, τὰν κύτισον, ὁ λύκος, τὰν αἶγα, ἃ γέρανος, τῷροτρον, 47, 52 ; XII, 14 ; XV, 58, τὸν ψυχρὸν ὄφιν (preceded by ἵππον without article ; the article visualizes, hence emphasizes the unpleasant), 83 ; XXI, 33, 66 ; XXIII, 28, 29, 30, 31 ; XXVII, 3, 9.

b. *With plural nouns :* I, 80, τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ῥήσολοι (v. l. αἰπόλοι), 90, 135, 136 ; II, 35 ; III, 26, 53 ; IV, 11,

¹ Krueger, II, 50, 4.

τὼς λύκος; v, 111, 112, τὰς δασυκέρκος ἀλώπεκας, 114, τὼς
καυθάρος,¹ 125; vi, 16; vii, 57, 120; viii, 38, 44, 48 (2), 49,
79; x, 29, ἀλλ' ἔμπας ἐν τοῖς στεφάνοις τὰ πρῶτα λέγονται,²
44; xv, 28, αἱ γαλέαι (perhaps, however, a term of reproach
applied to the awkward Eunoe); xxi, 22, 23; xxx, 15;
Berenike fr., 2, τὰ δίκτυα.

c. *With abstract nouns.* As with concrete nouns, so with
abstracts the generic article is not obligatory, and it is impossible
to establish sharp differences everywhere between articular and
anarthrous abstracts as Kuehner for example does.³ The article
with an abstract noun may be intended to designate not only an
individual phase of the abstract in a particular relation, with
anaphora, but also all phases and relations gathered into a single
concept—a strictly generic sense. The sphere of Theocritean poetry
precludes the free use of abstract nouns as such, and simple
abstracts are consequently not numerous. A tendency to personi-
fication is noted in a number of instances and in other cases there is
distinct anaphora. For convenience the arrangement of examples is
alphabetical. ἄλγος xx, 16 (anaphora)—ἔρως ii, 63; xi, 1, 80;
xxiii, 9; xxx, 9; with anaphora in ii, 63 and xi, 80. Otherwise
articular only with attributives: i, 93; ii, 69, etc. (refrain); x, 57;
xiv, 26; xxiii, 43. As a common noun ἔρως is anarthrous twelve
times in Doric idylls, five of these with prepositions.—κάλλος
xxiii, 32 (with attrib.). In ii, 83, κάλλος is concrete.—λάθος
xxiii, 24 (anaphora)—μέλημα xiv, 2 (anaphora)—μόχθος xxi,
2 (concrete in xvi, 60)—πενία xxi, 1, 16 (personification in both)

¹The relative clauses which follow the last two nouns are causal, and in 112
δασυκέρκος is an epithet.

²Fritzsche notes correctly: "in coronis vel nectendis vel a nobis conspectis (si
quis nectit coronas vel si nexas cum gaudio contemplamur)." Objection to τοῖς,
and its position in the verse, at the penthemimeral caesura, where it receives
undue emphasis according to Hermann (Opusc., v, 89), led the latter to emend
to ἐν τοῖς στεφάνω (odd. p. D., τῷ στεφάνω) and so Ameis (p. 9). But Fritzsche
shows (ad loc. and to viii, 5) that the verse is to be read with a caesura after
ἔμπας and after στεφάνοις. On the other hand ἐν τοῖς with superlatives seems
to be decidedly a prose use. See Krueger, i, 49, 10, 6.

³§ 461, 1, 2. Cf. Krueger, i, 50, 3, 3 and 4 and Hist. Philol. Studien, ii, p.
60, and see Gildersleeve, l. c.

—πόθος xxx, 21 (semipersonification)—φιλότης xii, 20 (with possessive). It is anarthrous as abstract xvi, 66 (epic); xviii, 54.—φροντίς xxi, 28 (personification and anaphora)—χάρις v, 37 (generic-semipersonification)—χρῆμα xxi, 25. In xv, 145 (cf. xviii, 4) the word is concrete. Here may be put also κωμῳδία, epigram viii (xvii), 1.

8. *The article with words and phrases used as substantives.* The use of the article with substantivized words and phrases was recognized by Apollonius in all cases save apparently with participles.¹ The use is so familiar that it requires no detailed discussion here. With substantivized words and phrases the article appears in all its functions, particular and generic. In the idylls of Theocritus the particular use is far the more common one. In the epic idylls cases of this use of the article are infrequent, especially in the two idylls where Homeric lines are most closely followed, xxii and xxv.

a. *With adjectives.* Most frequent are the cases where the article stands with substantivized adjectives.²

a. *Particular: Masculine.* ii, 112, ὤστοργος. iii, 4, τὸν ἐνόρχαν; 24, ὁ δύσσοος. vii, 5, χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν; 96, ὁ δειλός; 119, ὁ δύσμορος.³ xii, 23; xiv, 29; xv, 8, 12, 42, 53; xx, 18, 44; xxiii, 37; xxix, 20. Epigram, vi (xx), 2, τὸν λεοντομάχαν, τὸν ὀξύχειρα.

Feminine. i, 49, τὰν τρώξιμον (sc. σταφυλήν).⁴ ii, 72, 138; v, 51, 100; xv, 43, 145, ἡ θήλεια, the singer present. xviii, 4.

Neuter. (Neuters used adverbially with the article are not included here). i, 20, καὶ τᾶς βουκολικᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἵκεο Μοίρας. Here as in viii, 17, τὸ πλεόν seems to be "the prize."⁵

¹ Cf. introduction and below under "participles".

² Cf. Gildersleeve, Syntax, § 28 ff.

³ Ameis cites τὸν ξείνον from this passage and elsewhere as a substantivized adjective. Its use as a noun had become so fixed that it was no longer felt as a substantivized adjective in the sense in which it is here used.

⁴ It is unnecessary to take the article here as Fritzsche (ed. 1869) took it, "seine Appetitstraube, . . . die zum Essen bestimmte Traube," comparing τὰ διδάκτρα, viii, 86. Τὰν τρώξιμον is the edible fruit on the vine (l. 46).

⁵ So Fritzsche, but Cholmeley insists that τὸ πλεόν does not equal ἄκρον (Haupt, Opusc., ii, 312), but expresses simply a degree definitely higher than that reached

II, 36, 143.—III, 27, τό γε μὰν τεὸν ἀδὺ τέτυκται.¹ IV, 45; V, 71; VIII, 17; XIV, 11; XV, 78; XVI, 42; XVII, 118; XX, 31, τὰ δ' ἄστικὰ μ' οὐκ ἐφίλησεν—"that baggage (Euneike) with her city airs," with contemptuous reference to her own words (l. 4); not "those town girls," as Cholmeley translates.—XXIV, 72; XXVI, 24; XXIX, 5; XXX, 4.

β. *Generic: Singular.* The generic singular is rare and outside of neuter forms occurs but once: X, 17, τὸν ἀλιτρόν. The neuter is found in three places: XX, 19, τὸ κρήγυνον, equivalent to an abstract noun; XXIX, 6, τὸ δὲ λοιπόν, "all the rest." Epigram, IV (XII), 4, τὸ καλόν.—*Plural.* In the plural again most of the cases are neuter, but a few masculines and feminines do occur: XXI, 44. Epigram, VII (XVI), 5.—I, 87, τὰς μακάδας.² The remaining cases are all neuters: III, 31, τὰλαθέα "the truth." VI, 19; VII, 127; VIII, 42; XIII, 3; XIV, 50; XXVI, 32.

b. *With Participles.* It has been said (see introduction) that Apollonius did not recognize the use of the article with substantivized participles except in the case of a few stereotyped forms. As a matter of fact, because of their adjectival character, participles are treated in this respect exactly as adjectives are treated. Apollonius himself takes up cases where the participle is used as an

by others, just as VIII, 17 is according to him "the advantage," as V, 71. That there are, however, cases in Theocritus where there is a confusion of superlative and comparative is shown by Legrand (p. 311), who cites our passage. See, however, also Wilamowitz, *Textgeschichte*, p. 50, note. Taken in connection with the preceding, the meaning is clear: "you sang τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγεα and won the prize (*ἴκεο* aorist) for pastoral minstrelsy"—with a possible reference to the very contest mentioned, line 24.

¹ Fritzsche: "ad te quod attinet, tu quod sentis <τὸ τεόν> suave, hilare, laetum erit <ἀδὺ τέτυκται>." Compare schol. cd. κ, "τὸ σὸν μέρος." This construction is common enough (see Fritzsche, ad loc.) and is found in Pindar, *Pyth.*, xi, 41 (cf. *Pyth.*, v, 72). Meineke, however, followed by Hiller, renders: "tua tibi voluptas effecta est," connecting τὸ τεόν ἀδύ, and similarly Ameis (p. 11) and Snow. Cholmeley objects to this version on the ground that τὸ τεόν ἀδύ "could only mean 'your sweetness.'" But Aristotle, (*Rhet.*, I, 1354, b. 11) furnishes an exact parallel in ἐπισκοπεῖν τῇ κρῖσει τὸ ἴδιον ἢ δὴ λυπηρόν.

² Like ξείνος, μηκάς, "the bleating one," had practically become a noun. In the Thesaurus of Stephanos but one instance is cited where μηκάς is used as an adjective of something besides a goat, Soph., *Fr. Amphiar.* Nauck *Fr.* 466, *μηκάδος βοός.*

adjective in the first attributive position,¹ and with 'ὁ τυραννοκτονήσας τιμάσθω' he illustrates a generic use of the article which he characterizes as *προληπτικώτερον*.²

In Theocritus substantivized participles with the article do not occur in the strictly epic idylls and they were probably not used by Homer. As in the case of adjectives the generic use is to be distinguished from the particular.

a. Particular. Here the anaphoric value of the article appears in all its phases, with reference to definite persons or things: XI, 19, τὸν φιλέοντα. XIII, 68, τῶν παρόντων. This is the only idyl of the epic group that shows examples of this type. Two other cases, both generic, occur in the same poem. (See below.) XV, 47, ὁ τεκῶν,³ 54, 77. XXIII, 3, 62–63, τοὶ φιλέοντες, ὁ μισῶν, οἱ μισεῖντες. XXIX, 9, 18.—Here belong also those cases where the participle with the article is used in apposition with a noun or pronoun. So with nouns: I, 63, Ἀἶδαν τὸν ἐκλάβοντα, 120, 121. XIII, 7; XIV, 53. Epigram, IV (XII), 1; VIII (XVII), 1.—With pronouns: XXVIII, 8; XXIX, 32. Three cases may also be mentioned, where the participle with the article precedes a proper name: III, 32, χά πρᾶν ποιολογεῖσα Παραίβατις; 49, ὁ τὸν ἄτροπον ἵππον ἰαύων | Ἐνδυμίων; V, 4, τὸν μὲν τὰν σύριγγα πρῶαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν. Of these the first and the last have been enumerated above among proper names with the article, but in the remaining case, the position of Ἐνδυμίων at the head of the following verse indicates that the participle was felt as an appositive.

β. Generic: Singular. VIII, 17, ὁ νικῶν, "the winner," 48. X, 53; XI, 75, τὰν παρεοῖσαν ἄμελγε. τί τὸν φεύγοντα διώκεις (proverbial). XII, 13, 16; XIV, 62, τὸν φιλέοντα, τὸν οὐ φιλέοντα (= τὸν μισεῖντα, hence οὐ. Cf. VI, 17). XV, 25, 48, 126. The only generic neuter singulars are: XXIII, 27, τὸ μέλλον, and epigram IV (XII), 4, τὸ προσήκον.

¹Syntax I, 34, p. 68, Bekker.

²Synt., p. 27.

³Τεκῶν had become so thoroughly substantivized as to be construed with a dependent genitive; f. i., Eur. Elec., 335; Ion., 308; Alc., 167.

Plural. x, 8, τῶν ἀπεόντων; xii, 2, οἱ δὲ ποθεῦντες; xiii, 66 (epic); xxiii, 24; xxix, 30; xxx, 15.—Actual omissions of this article with substantivized adjectives and participles are rare outside of the epic idylls. In the Doric idylls we may note: iii, 47, ἐπὶ πλέον . . . λύσσας; xv, 27, ἐς μέσον, both phraseological; xv, 142; vi, 17; viii, 66.

c. *With adverbs.* Three cases are to be distinguished here; first, when the adverb is used as a noun, second, when it is used as an adjective, third, when it preserves its adverbial character.

a. *Used as nouns.* This use of the article is denied to Homer. Where forms of the article stand with adverbs they are explained as demonstratives.¹ Occurrences of this use in Theocritus are infrequent, two in epic.—v, 28, τὸν πλατίον; x, 3, τῷ πλατίον, 9, τῶν ἔκτοθεν; xiii, 4, τὸ δ' αὔριον; xvi, 13, τῶν ὠν (taken by Ameis, p. 6, as demonstrative, in the Homeric manner); xxv, 216, τὸ μεσηγύ. Epigr. vii (xvi), 4, τῶν πρόσθε.

β. *Used as attributive adjectives,* with nouns expressed or understood, generally in the first attributive position. One instance of this use and the first position is cited from Homer, *Il.* xiv, 274. Two cases appear in epic idylls: xxii, 38, αἱ δ' ἰπένερθεν | λάλλαι—where the article may be considered demonstrative, and xxv, 236, ὁ πρὶν (sc. οἰστός). The remaining cases are i, 24; vii, 136; xv, 141; xxx, 21. Epigram, vi (xx), 3. Once we find the adverb with the article following the noun, like the appositive use in Homer,¹ f. i. *Il.* ix, 559, and *Od.* xxii, 220. The case in Theocritus is vii, 5, χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν.

γ. *Preserving their adverbial character.*² This use is frequent enough in Homer, and with adverbial accusatives of adjectives is found in Pindar.³ The article is not restricted to local and temporal adverbs, but these categories cover most cases. In Theocritus the construction is frequent in Doric idylls, and three cases occur in epic. Temporal adverbs or neuter adjectives are

¹ Foerstemann, p. 19.

² Krueger, i, 50, 5, 10 and 13. ii, 50, 5, 10 and 11. Kuehner, § 461, 6.

³ Stein, p. 40.

the most common. I, 41, *κάμνοντι τὸ καρτερόν*. III, 3, *τίτυρ' ἐμὴν τὸ καλὸν πεφιλημένε*.¹ III, 18, *τὸ καλὸν ποθορώσα*. Other cases are the following: *Temporal*: I, 15; II, 144; IV, 3; V, 13, 113, 126; X, 2, 29, 48; XV, 15; XVII, 75; XX, 21; XXII, 4; XXV, 240; XXIII, 40.—*Adverbs of manner*: III, 18; VII, 59, 98; XV, 58.—Omission of the article may be noted in I, 34, *καλόν*; VII, 21, *μεσαμέριον*; ² VIII, 16, *ποθέσπερα*.

d. *With prepositional phrases*. Masculine and feminine forms to designate persons do not occur in Theocritus. a. The purely substantive use of prepositional phrases occurs only in the neuter in four instances: X, 14, *τὰ πρὸ θυρῶν*. XXVIII, 25, *τὰ παρ φίλῳ*. XXII, (epic) 22, *τὰ πρὸς πλόον*, 61, *τὰ τ' ἐξ ἐμεῦ* (sc. *ξένια*).—β. The appositive use of articular prepositional phrases, found also in Homer, occurs in Theocritus as follows: I, 1, *ἀ πίτυς . . . τήνα ἀ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι*, 65, *Θύρσις δδ' ὥξ Αἴτνας*; V, 52, 65; VII, 40, 151; XI, 7; XXVI, 4 (epic). Epigram, VI (XX), 4.—γ. Most common are the cases where a prepositional phrase stands in the first attributive position: I, 30, *ἀ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν . . . ἔλιξ*, 72; II, 33; V, 47, 49, 57; VI, 18; VII, 7, 130, 138; XXV, 180 (epic); XXVIII, 17; XXX, 27.

e. *With the infinitive*. We would naturally expect but little use of the articular infinitive in Theocritus. Doubt has been cast on each of the three cases that are cited (from Doric idylls). In IX, 13, *τῷ δὲ θέρεος φρύγοντος ἐγὼ τόσσον μελεδαίνω | ὅσσον ἐρῶν τὸ πατρὸς μύθων καὶ ματρὸς ἀκούειν*, various changes are made.³—No certain parallel has yet been cited for such a use of the infinitive for a concrete noun as is found in X, 53, *οὐ μελεδαίνει τὸν τὸ πιεῖν ἐγγεῖντα*. Here, as in the passage cited as parallel from

¹ Τὸ καλὸν troubled the scholiast who explains: *ἡγουν διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἐμοὶ πεφίλ. ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ καλῶς. ἢ διὰ τὸ καλὸν . . . ἢ τὸ καλὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ λίαν*. Editors (Cholmeley ad loc., Fritzsche to I, 41) cite as parallels to this use of the article with neuter adjectives for adverbs of quality, Lucian, *Amor.* 26, *ὑακίνθοις τὸ καλὸν ἀνθοῦσιν* (cf. ib. 3), Herondas, I, 54, *Anthol. Pal.*, VII, 219, Callim., *Ep.* 52, and others (see Legrand, p. 308), which show that the construction is late. As in the case of other adverbs, the article lends definiteness. Cf. I, 34, where the article is omitted.

² Now probably correctly read *τὸ μεσ.* by Wilamowitz for *τὸ μεσ.*

³ See Fritzsche's critical note.

Anthol. Pal. XII, 34, 4: εἰς ἔφερεν τὸ φαγεῖν, εἰς δὲ πιεῖν ἐδίδου, changes have also been made to avoid the article, tho most editors keep the reading given. The verbs used here, belonging as they do to the sphere of vulgar language would be especially prone to such an extension of the articular infinitive.¹ In XI, 60, νῦν αὖ τό γα νεῖν μεμαθεῦμαι, editors generally write αὐτό γα, αὐτόθι or similar forms.

9. *The article with appositive nouns.* a. When a noun is used in apposition with another noun, it takes the article if it does not simply express an attribute or predicate, but adds a definite and distinguishing characteristic. The article then has anaphoric value. Apollonius² lays it down as a law, that an appositive added to a proper noun always takes the article: τὰ δὲ ἐπιθετικά ἐπὶ συντάσσονται κυρίοις ὀνόμασι, πάντως σὺν ἄρθροις λέγεται, εἰ μὴ τὰ ὑπαρκτικά τῶν ῥημάτων ἐπιφέροιτο. This is too general a statement, since numerous cases arise where the appositive stands without the article.³ As a matter of fact, the rule stated at the beginning of this paragraph applies also in the case of proper names followed by an appositive, for if the appositive simply adds an attribute which does not distinguish the individual the article is unnecessary.⁴ For Theocritus we may cite III, 31, ἃ Γραῖω . . . κοσκινόμαντις (?). VII, 3 f. καὶ Φρασίδαμος | κ' Ἀντιγένης δύο τέκνα Λυκώρεος. VIII, 93; XIV, 24; XXVIII, 6; XXIX, 38. Epigr., VII, 2, and others, besides many in epic idylls. Only two cases are cited below from an epic idyl where the appositive has the article, XIII, 5, and 19, of which the former is not in the epyllion proper. For cases where the proper name also has the article, see above under proper names.

a. The appositive may precede, and then it has the greater emphasis: I, 113, τὸν βούταν νικῶ Δάφνιν. III, 43; IV, 33; V, 80; XIII, 19; XIV, 1, 12; XV, 11, 18, 22, 110, 120; XIX, 1. Epigram, VIII (XVII), 1; IX (XXI), 1.

¹ Cf. A. J. P., III, 195.

² Syntax, 32, p. 65. 11, Bekker.

³ See Kuehner, § 462 A. Amn. 1.

⁴ Cf. Fuller, p. 66f. for examples from Aristophanes.

β. The appositive may follow, and then the greater emphasis is upon the noun which it modifies: II, 146, Φιλίστας . . . τᾶς ἀμᾶς αὐλητρίδος. III, 4, 26; IV, 21, τοὶ τῷ Λαμπριάδα τοὶ δαμόται; "the people (descendants) of Lampriades, the demesmen" (cf. IV, 33; XIII, 5). V, 10, 15, 64; VI, 44; VII, 73; VIII, 34; XIII, 5; XIV, 13, 24; XV, 138, 139; XXI, 9 ff. τὰ ταῖν χειρῶν ἀθλήματα, τοὶ καλαθίσκοι, | τοὶ κάλαμοι, τᾶγκιστρα, τὰ φυκιδέντα δέλητα | (ὄρμαι κυρτοὶ τε καὶ ἐκ σχοίνων λαβύρινθοι | μήρινθοι κώπα τε γέρων τ' ἐπ' ἐρέισμασι λέμβος). Here τοὶ καλαθίσκοι, etc., are in exegetic apposition with τὰ ἀθλήματα. The omission of the article with the other nouns in the series is noteworthy. At first the article retards the description. Each group of implements is a picture by itself: "the baskets, the rods, etc.," of their trade, and then in a rapid sweep are added, in a confused heap, "lines, wells, traps, cords, an oar and an old boat on stays."—XXIII, 21. Epigram, IV (XII), 1; VI (XX), 2. Omissions of the article with nouns in apposition with common nouns also occur. So II, 121; VII, 11; XV, 97, etc., but mostly in epic idylls.

b. A common type of apposition is that where a noun stands in apposition with a personal pronoun expressed or understood. A noun or substantivized word standing in this relation generally takes the article, because the reference is necessarily definite in most cases. The appositive may precede or follow the pronoun to which it belongs: I, 116, ὁ βουκόλος . . . ἐγὼ Δάφνις. II, 72, ἐγὼ . . . ὁ μέγαλοιτος, 138; III, 19, πρόσπτυξαί με τὸν αἰπόλον;¹ V, 90; XI, 39; XII, 23; XIV, 56. XVIII, 22, ἄμμες δ' αἱ πᾶσαι συνομάλικες. Here αἱ πᾶσαι is generally taken with συνομάλικες as predicate to ἄμμες. It seems better, however, to take αἱ πᾶσαι alone, in apposi-

¹ Fritzche expands on the article here saying: "hunc qualem coram vides caprarium, h. e., qualis esse caprarius verus debet, hominem haud contemnendum. Aliquoties Theocritus quum quis de se ipso atque officio suo et vitae genere praedicat, ita ponit articulum, ut aut cum conscientia quadam dignitatis suae ea persona, quae verba facit, loqui videatur, aut, id quod redit eodem, officium eius notum significetur." He compares V, 88, 90; XIV, 56. It cannot however be maintained that in all these cases there is ἀναφορά κατ' ἐξοχήν—for that is what Fritzche's note seems to say for this instance.

tion with ἄμμες.—xx, 18; xxiii, 37; xxviii, 8; xxix, 32. Epigram, iv (xii), 2. With pronouns implied or understood we find an articular appositive in iii, 24, and xiv, 29. Here belong those cases where the noun with the article, in the nominative case, stands in apposition with an expressed or unexpressed vocative.¹ This use, found also in Homer, is more common in the plural, where distinct forms for the vocative are wanting, but the singular of common as well as proper nouns is similarly found; so, Arist. Birds, 665, ἡ Πρόκη | ἔκβαυε; cf. *ib.*, 1628; Plut., 1100; Lucian Deor. Dial., 20, σὺ δὲ πρόσιθι ἡ' Ἀθηνᾶ. Following examples of plurals are found in Theocritus:² i, 151, αἱ δὲ χίμαιραι, | οὐ μὴ σκιρτησεῖτε; v, 100, 108 (?), 110; viii, 67; xxiii, 62, 63.—In the singular are found the following, all names of animals: iv, 45, σίτθ' ὁ Λέπαργος (or λέπαργος), 46, ἃ Κυμαίθα (v. l. ὦ K.); with οὗτος, v, 102, 147. In i, 151, the name of an animal is thus used without the article.

10. *The article with the predicate.* The fact that the predicate usually adds something previously not known of the subject, and is indefinite in the sense that it designates the class to which the subject belongs, causes the predicate in most cases to stand without the article. But when the predicate is to be regarded as known and definite, it takes the article in the same way as other nouns, and subject and predicate are equivalent. If the subject itself is anarthrous the predicate cannot take the article, unless the nature of the subject is such as to make it definite without the article, or the predicate is a word which requires the article to complete its meaning.³ Cases are rare in Theocritus where an actual predicate has the article. *Id.* iii, 13, αἶθε γενοίμαν | ἃ βομβεῦσα μέλισσα. Editors usually call the article deictic, explaining that the speaker points to a bee that happens to be flying about. Theocritus shows a fondness for the generic article, and since there is nothing in the passage to indicate emphatic

¹ See Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, § 13; Krueger, i, 45, 2, 6; ii, 50, 7, 4.

² Cf. Ameis, p. 17.

³ See especially J. Dornseiffen, *o. c.*, and A. Proksch, *o. c.*, who eliminated many cases of articular nouns falsely understood as predicates. This special work has however yielded little that is not in the grammars.

deixis, it seems better to call the article here generic.—XXI, 14, οὗτος τοῖς ἀλιεύσιν ὁ πᾶς πόρος, οὗτος ὁ πλούτος. The article has possessive value. (Οὗτος by attraction for ταῦτα, referring to the list of implements described in the preceding lines).—XXI, 36, ἀλλ' ὄνος ἐν ῥάμνῳ τό τε λύχνιον ἐν πρυτανείῳ: "he is (like) an ass in the bramble, and the (proverbial) light in the Prytaneum." Ameis, (p. 4), reading τὸ δέ (mss.; τό τε is Haupt's correction), takes the article as substantive subject with λύχνιον predicate. (Cf. Hermann, Opusc. v, 112).

In other cases that have been cited as instances of articular predicates, the articular noun is to be taken as subject (so where one member of a sentence is an interrogative pronoun, f. i. XIV, 2, τί δέ τοι τὸ μέλημα). This is true of XXI, 33, οὗτος ἄριστος ὀνειροκρίτας, ὁ διδάσκαλός ἐστι παρ' ᾧ νοῦς, which Ameis, (p. 19), renders: "cui mens est pro suo magistro." Ὁ διδάσκαλος etc., logically answers the question τίς ὁ διδάσκαλος with the predicate νοῦς.—In x, 29, τὰ πρᾶτα has been taken adverbially (see above) while αἱ πᾶσαι in XVIII, 22, has been construed as in apposition with the subject ἄμμες (see above under 9 b).

Somewhat different are the cases where an articular noun stands as indirect predicate after verbs of making, calling, and similar verbs. So, f. i., VIII, 17, τί δέ τὸ πλέον ἐξεί οὐκῶν. Here τί πλέον would simply mean "what more" while τί τὸ πλέον is "what is the prize the victor will get." Compare VIII, 86 and III, 7.

11. *The article with nouns accompanied by attributive adjectives.* When the article is used with a noun accompanied by an attributive adjective, the adjective may occupy one of three positions. These positions are regularly designated as the first, second and third attributive position respectively, as the adjective stands between the article and the noun, or follows the articular noun with an article of its own, or with its own article follows the anarthrous noun.¹ Of these positions the first is logically the simplest, and is therefore designated by Aristotle (Rhet. 1407, b. 37) as the position which contributes to συντομία in composi-

¹ See Mildén, "Limitations of the Predicative Position in Greek," introd.

tion. In the second position each article has its own value.¹ Aristotle mentions this position (l. c. line 36) as one of the elements that contribute to *ῥυκος* in composition, and it has been called the "oratorical" position. In the third position the noun is stated simply, without being indicated as definite or known, and the adjective with its article is added much like an afterthought to explain the noun. Aristotle does not directly mention this position. Professor Gildersleeve has called it the position that "is, or affects to be, easy" and "familiar,"² and has pointed out that its interpretation depends upon the grammatical stage of the language. "When the article is still largely implicit, when *νῖος* is *ὁ νῖος* then *νῖος ὁ ἐμός* = *ὁ νῖος ὁ ἐμός*. When it is explicit, then *νῖος ὁ ἐμός* has a decidedly naïve effect, the afterthought *ὁ ἐμός* is a *grata negligentia*, a slipshoddiness of the Greeks." Since poetry can omit the article, can resort to the implicit article, the third position may be used as a poetical equivalent for the second position. This is especially the case where the noun has more than one attributive, as, f. i., *Id.* xvi, 44, i, 126. *

Of the three positions, the first is far the most common in Theocritus, while the second is the least common, and the third is only about one fourth as common as the first position. Where the adjective is a possessive, the first position is regular in Theocritus, only one instance of each of the other positions being found.

a. *First attributive position*: i, 3, 7, 13, 20, 61, 133, 146; ii, 12, 94, 102, 115, 118, 126, 156; iii, 5, 46, 49, 13 (participle); iv, 19, 40, 59; v, 17, 24, 87, 101, 112; vi, 11, 16 (twice), 36; vii, 10, 39, 65, 87, 118, 121, 123, 132, 152; viii, 47, 49, 56, 62, 86; x, 20, 24, 28, 41; xi, 6, 8, 35, 39, 43, 47, 53; xii, 20, 28, 35; xiii, 5, 7, 11, 16, 19; xiv, 8, 12, 26; xv, 4, 33, 34, 51, 58, 81, 86, 110, 128; xvi (epic), 22; xvii (epic), 26; xviii, 5, 19, 28, 31; xx, 5, 33; xxi, 10, 14, 19, 26, 55, 66, 67; xxii (epic), 34, 140, 189; xxiii, 51; xxiv

¹ Apollonius Synt., i, 40, p. 80, 12, Bekker, τῶν δύο ἀρθρων δύο ἀναφορὰς διαφόρους δηλούντων.

² See his Justin Martyr A., 6, 7; A. J. P., vi, 262, xvii, 518.

(epic), 61 (ἄλλος), 63; XXVI (epic), 1, 24 (ἄλλος); XXVII, 1; XXVIII, 23; XXIX, 16, 37; XXX, 25. Epigram, I, 1, 3. For adverbs and prepositional phrases used attributively in this position see above under 8 c and d.

b. *Second attributive position.* No examples of this position are found in epic idylls save XIII, 6, and this does not stand in the epyllion proper. Following examples occur: IV, 20; V, 99, 108; VII, 98; VIII, 27; XIII, 6; XV, 127. Epigram, I, 1. Here may be mentioned also V, 11, τὸ Κροκύλος μοι ἔδωκέ, τὸ ποικίλον, answering the question τὸ ποῖον . . . νάκος. The adjective takes this position in three cases where the noun is accompanied by a demonstrative: I, 23; V, 147. Epigram, III (x), 2. Similarly once with αὐτός, V, 14. Four instances where a prepositional phrase stands in this position have been cited above, under 8 d β.¹

c. *Third attributive position.* The addition to proper names of an adjective in this position has already been discussed (see 6 a end). Outside the sphere of proper names the following cases have been noted: I, 124; III, 37; V, 36; VIII, 74, λόγον . . . τὸν πικρόν (vv. ll.); X, 18; XI, 46, ἄμπελος ἁ γλυκύκαρπος;² XXI, 8; XXIII, 32; XXV (epic) 27; XXIX, 19; and with a preceding demonstrative, II, 30.³

d. *When the articular noun is accompanied by two or more attributive modifiers,* Attic prose usage permits a choice of positions within certain limitations.⁴ Stated generally, the rule is, that, when two attributives without a conjunction are joined to a noun by means of the article, usually either both stand between the article and noun, or one (or even both) follows the noun with the article repeated. According to Krueger, when both attributives are adjectives, they are usually both inserted in the first position

¹ For cases where one of two adjective attributives takes this position see below under d.

² In this description put into the mouth of the Cyclops, the omission of the article with the other nouns is noteworthy. The Cyclops emphasizes what is good to eat and drink, the product of the vine (cf. Legrand, 307, 364). Note that in English also *the vine* par excellence is the grape).

³ For participles, adverbs and prepositional phrases in this position see above under 8, and for cases where the noun has more than one attributive see below.

⁴ Krueger, I, 50, 9 ff. Kuehner, § 464, 7.

only when one adjective forms a single concept with the noun, and the other adjective modifies the complex. In Homer¹ the combination of two attributives with an articular noun is rare, and in most cases both attributives stand between the article and the noun. This is also the most common position in Theocritus. With two adjectives we find the following cases: II, 3, τὸν ἐμὸν < βαρὺν εὖντα > φίλον . . . ἄνδρα; x, 57; xv, 138. Where one modifier is an adjective, the other a genitive or some other modifier, the inside position for both attributives is found: I, 92, τὸν αὐτῷ . . . πικρὸν ἔρωτα; vii, 80, 136, 138; xvi, 90 (epic); xviii, 6. In one case two adjectives joined by καί take this position: xxx, 1, καὶ τῷ χαλεπῷ καὶ νομόρῳ τῷδε νοσήματος. In v, 84, a predicate adjective is inserted by hyperbaton: πλὰν δύο τὰς λοιπὰς διδυματόκος αἰγας ἀμέλγω (cf. Ameis, p. 15).

In one instance two attributive adjectives, each with an article, precede the noun: vi, 22, τὸν ἐμὸν τὸν ἓνα γλυκύν. Compare Thuc., 8, 23, 4, ταῖς μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ναυσὶ καὶ ταῖς τρισὶ ταῖς Χίαις παρέπλει, and other examples cited by Kuehner, § 464, 7, c. (cf. Ameis, p. 21).—In xiii, 5, ὠμφιτρύωνος ὁ χαλκεοκάρδιος υἱός, ὃς τὸν λῖν ὑπέμεινε,—ὁ χαλκ. υἱός is in apposition with the elliptical ὠμφιτρύωνος.

In a few cases one attributive precedes with the article, while the other follows with the article repeated: I, 141, τὸν Μοῖσαις φίλον ἄνδρα, τὸν οὐ Νύμφαισιν ἀπεχθῆ. II, 70, ἡ Θευχαρίδα θρᾶσσα τροφὸς ἡ μακαρίτις | ἀγχίθυρος ναίουσα;² vii, 39; xiii, 7. In iii, 45, an adjective and a genitive follow in the third attributive position. Twice we find positions not sanctioned by prose usage: I, 126, αἰπύ τε σᾶμα | τῇνο Λυκαονίδαο, τὸ καὶ

¹ Krueger, II, 50, 9 and Anm.

² Θρᾶσσα because of its position can hardly be a proper name as some editors take it. Fritzsche's argument for μακαρίτις as a proper name, on the ground that the girl here speaking would scarcely call "μακαρίτις" an old woman who had brought all her woe upon her, cannot be taken seriously. Μακαρίτης, fem. μακαρίτις seems to have been commonly used of the dead with about as much sincerity as "der seelige" in modern German. Πᾶς γὰρ λέγει τις 'ὁ μακαρίτης οἵχεται' (Stobaeus Flor. 121, 18, cf. Hiller ad loc.). Compare Herondas, vi, 55, Κυλαίτις ἡ μακαρίτις.

μακάρεσσιν ἀγητόν, and xvi, (epic) 44, δεινὸς ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κῆμος, where the omission of the article before the nouns is poetical. The article is unrepeatd with a genitive, following an articular noun with an adjective in the first attributive position, in xv, 51, and so frequently where the genitive is a personal pronoun.

12. *Predicative position.*¹ An adjective modifier either preceding or following a noun and its article is said to stand in the predicative position. The relation of the adjective to the noun is then that of predicate to subject, with a form of the participle understood. A noun thus attended by a predicative adjective is not distinguished from other individuals of its class, but its present attribute is contrasted with other attributes of itself. In translation the article is often omitted.²

Simple cases of this construction with nouns in the nominative case are the following: iv, 5, Αὐτὸς . . . ἄφαντος ὁ βουκόλος ὄχρετο. xi, 67, ἃ μάτηρ ἀδικεῖ με μόνα, cf. xxi, 1.—xv, 53; xx, 24; xxiii, 24; xxv, 236 (epic). Cases where there is an ellipsis of the verb *ἐστί* need not be cited. Such ellipses are very common in Theocritus, especially in idylls viii and xv.

The most common type of the predicative modifier in Theocritus is that of oblique predication in the accusative case, with verbs of calling, making, and a few others. Of the adverbial dative and prepositional types discussed by Mildén (o. c.) no examples occur in Theocritus. Of the accusative type following instances have been noted: iv, 13, τὸν βουκόλον ὡς κακὸν εἶρον; vi, 7; x, 2; xix, 8; xxi, 23, 47; xxix, 18. (In xxvii, 37, τὰ δὲ πῶεα καλὰ νομεύω, καλὰ is used adverbially with the verb). Add to these three instances of oblique predication in the accusative with parts of the body: xx, 8, μαλακὸν τὸ γένειον ἔχεις; xxix, 33; xxx, 28. All of the cases so far cited are easily explained in conformity with Attic usage. The four cases remaining have caused commentators no little trouble.—i, 95, ἦνθέ γε μὰν ἀδεία καὶ ἃ Κύπρις γελάοισα. Here as in the other three cases presently to be cited, Legrand, (p. 309), believes that we must admit faulty

¹See Mildén, "Limitations of the Predicative Position in Greek."

²See Gildersleeve to Justin Martyr A., 17, 11.

construction, that in every case the adjective ought to stand between the article and noun. None of the passages, however, save IV, 49, need cause any real difficulty. In the passage just cited, *ἀδεία* belongs to the predicate, with the participle *γελάδουσα*. Cholmeley correctly compares Pind. Pyth. VIII, 12 (10), *τραχεία δυσμενέων . . . ὑπαντιάξαισα κράτει*. In Theocritus we find the same construction in V, 90, *ὁ Κρατίδας τὸν ποιμένα λείος ὑπαντῶν | ἐκμαίνει*, for which Ameis, (p. 41), also believed that a transposition of the article must be assumed. The construction does not differ from XX, 24, *καὶ λευκὸν τὸ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὄφρυσι λάμπε μελαίναις*.¹—In I, 109, *ὠραῖος χῶδωνις ἐπεὶ καὶ μᾶλα νομεύει*, we have to do simply with an ellipsis of *ἐστί* and *ὠραῖος* is predicate to *ὁ Ἀδωνις*.—In XXIX, 33, *ἀνίκα τὰν γένυν ἀνδρεῖαν ἔχης*, we have a construction familiar enough with parts of the body, and this, together with two other examples of the same kind, has already been cited under "oblique predication."—There remains only IV, 49, *εἴθ' ἦν μοι ροικόν τὸ λαγωβόλον* (*τι* for *τό* Hermann, Wilamowitz, *τὸ* codd., *τυ* P.). The scholiast vet., noting the position of *ροικόν*, explains fancifully: *ράβδον οὖσαν ὀρθὴν ἐπεύχεται γενέσθαι καμπύλην, ἵνα μὴ ἔγκυν οὖσαν βλάβῃ τὴν βοῦν*. The parallels cited by Fritzsche and others for this position of *ροικόν* are accusatives and datives of the type discussed by Mildner, and do not explain this passage. The same is true of the prepositional type cited from Lucian by Cholmeley, while the latter's suggestion '*Ροικόν*, "my staff Crookie," is unsupported. To take *ροικόν* as the direct predicate of *τὸ λαγωβόλον* does not suit, since a *λαγωβόλον* is naturally *ροικόν* (cf. VII, 18, where a *λαγωβόλον* is called a *ροικὰ κορύνα*). Unless we admit hyperbaton of the adjective attribute, *τι* for *τό* seems the only present solution of the passage.

Of other cases of the predicative position where Ameis, (p. 41), sees difficulty, XX, 24 and XXI, 23, have been disposed of above. Two others remain to be mentioned: XV, 145, *τὸ χρῆμα σοφώτερον*, where *ἐστί* is to be supplied, and XXVII, 58,

¹ On the whole passage see Seymour, Proc. Am. Phil. Ass'n, July, 1882, p. xli, "On the Smile of Aphrodite."

τὰμπέχονον ποίησας ἐμὸν ῥάκος, for which see below under "article with possessives."

Among participial modifiers no examples of the type discussed by Milden occur in our poet.

13. *The use of the article in genitive combinations.* In the case of nouns accompanied by dependent genitives, two kinds of relations are distinguishable, an attributive relation and a partitive relation.¹

a. *Attributive position.* A simple attributive genitive depending upon an articular governing noun is generally treated as an attributive adjective and stands in an attributive position. The genitive usually has an article of its own, except when it is a proper noun.² In Theocritus there are few instances of such positions outside of proper nouns.

In three cases an anarthrous genitive of a common noun stands in the first attributive position: xv, 107, ὠνθρώπων ὡς μῦθος (most edd. now ἀνθρώπων).—xvi, 90, αἱ δ' ἀνάριθμοι | μῆλων χιλιάδες, apparent hyperbaton of a partitive genitive. But the idyl is epic and αἱ δ' may be the true reading (v. l. αἷ τε).—xxvii, 46, τὰ βουκόλῳ ἔργα, where βουκόλῳ is generic.—Genitives of proper nouns are more numerous: i, 19; ii, 8, 21, 62 (τὰ Δέλφιδος ὄστια, tho parts of the body usually stand in the partitive position), 70, 146, ἃ τε Φιλίστας | μάτηρ τᾶς ἀμᾶς αἰλητρίδος ἃ τε Μελιξοῦς,³ 160. v, 20, 114; xvi, 6.—In two cases anarthrous genitives of proper nouns follow articular governing nouns with the article repeated, i. e., in the second attributive position: ii, 74, τὰν ξυστίδα τὰν Κλεαρίστας.⁴ vii, 10.—

¹ Krueger, i, 47, 9, 9; Studien, ii, p. 78. Kuehner, § 464, 3.

² Apollonius Syntax, i, 42, p. 84, Bekker.

³ The context, esp. l. 154, shows that, in spite of the τε . . . τε, one woman, mother of both girls, is meant. Changes in the text and assumption of a lacuna (Fritzsche) are unnecessary. Parallels with similar repetition of the article with connectives can be cited. So Cholmeley cites Xen. Anab., iii, 117; Plato Rep., 334 E; Ant., i, 21; Dem. De Cor., 205; Add Ant., v, 63, and Dem. In Meid., 124, and see Maetzner to Ant., i, 21.

⁴ Fritzsche (et al.) writes τᾶς Κλ. after certain edd., and notes: "congruit consuetudini Theocr. artic. personae designandae appositus." But a parallel for an articular genitive of a proper noun in such a position cannot be cited from

Once the anarthrous genitive of a proper noun occupies the third attributive position in conjunction with an adjective: III, 45.

Articular attributive genitives in a few instances stand in the first attributive position. Two of the genitives are common nouns: x, 52; XXI, 9; three are proper nouns: xv, 97. Epigram, II (VII), 1; VI (xx), 1.

b. *Partitive position.* A dependent genitive, articular¹ or anarthrous, preceding or following an articular governing noun, is said to stand in the partitive position. In the case of actual partitive genitives this is the regular position, tho by hyperbaton such genitives sometimes stand between the article and the governing noun.² Except in the case already cited (see under a), xvi, 90, Theocritus observes this rule for partitives.³

a. With substantivized adjectives denoting a part, the partitive genitive is anarthrous in xv, 139; xvii, 2, 12; xviii, 4; xxiv, 37, 72; xxv, 216. Epigram, iv (xii,) 2. Five of these stand in epic idylls. It is articular twice: i, 20; xxix, 5.

β. With parts of the body and analogous nouns the genitive, in partitive position, is articular, save in xxvi, 20 (epic). The articular genitive precedes: iv, 15, 44–45; x, 46. The genitive follows: viii, 76; x, 39, τὰν ἰδέαν τὰς ἀρμονίας (cf. Kock to Arist. Birds 993); xv, 33; xxvi, 20 (epic), χαῖ μὲν τὰν κεφαλὰν μυκήσατο παιδὸς ἐλοῖσα (where μάτηρ μὲν stands for χαῖ μὲν τὰν in some cdd.).

γ. Examples are also found in Theocritus, as occasionally in Attic prose (esp. Thucydides,—Kuehner, § 464, 3 A 1), where purely attributive genitives stand in partitive positions. In one case the genitive is articular: xv, 52; otherwise anarthrous: v, 1 (?), 73; xiv, 52; xxiii, 23–24.

c. *Omission of the article with the governing noun, while the*

Theocritus, who uses few articular adnominal genitives of proper nouns, save with nouns of relationship. In xxvii, 14, we have a proper adjective; in xxi, 55, and i, 20, added attributives.

¹ Apoll. Synt. i, 10, p. 35, Bekker.

² Krueger, i, 47, 9, 11.

³ See Kallenberg, Jahresb. d. Phil. Ver. zu Berlin 23, 199 and 200; cf. J. B. 1892, 312.

genitive is articular. Most cases of this kind in Theocritus can be explained from the character of the governing noun, which may be indefinite, accompanied by an interrogative or indefinite pronoun, a vocative, or a predicate, while the genitive is a noun with definite reference and hence is naturally articular. In a few cases the omission of the article is poetical.

α. The governing noun precedes : x, 9, *τίς πόθος τῶν ἔκτοθεν*. XXI, 66 ; XXIII, 14, *ὑβριν τᾶς ὀργᾶς* ; XXVIII, 23.

β. The governing noun follows : VI, 10, *ἃ τοι τῶν ὄτων ἔπεται σκοπός* (*σκοπός* is subsidiary predicate), 13, 37 ; VIII, 49 ; XXI, 2, 55 ; XXIII, 7 ; XXVII, 14.

δ. *The partitive genitive with interrogative and indefinite pronouns.* Here the article is more often omitted in Theocritus with the genitive than it is used. But most of the omissions are found in epic idylls, while only one case occurs in this group where the article is used (xvi, 13). Apollonius¹ states it as a rule that the partitive genitive after *τίς* and *ποῖος*, unless it is a pronoun, always has the article. The following cases occur in Theocritus where the genitive is articular : v, 148 ; VII, 5 ; (cf. Epigram VII (xvi), 4.)—x, 8, 15 ; xvi, 13 (epic) ; XXI, 44. Most of the genitives are substantivized words. Anarthrous genitives with *τίς* in Doric idylls are only II, 83, and VII, 24.

ε. *Forms of the article, with the noun unexpressed, followed by dependent genitives.* Here there is always a familiar ellipsis which need not, if indeed it can, be supplied in all cases. The most common type in Theocritus is that with neuter plural forms of the article, designating property, actions, affairs, etc. : II, 76, *τὰ Λύκωνος*, Lykon's (house, shop, garden or what not).² IV, 23, *τὰ Φύσκω*, 31, *τὰ Γλαύκας*, *τὰ Πύρρῳ* (sc. *μέλη*).—Cf. Arist. Birds 919, Clouds 1365). v, 112 ; VIII, 20 ; x, 41 ; XIII, 67 (epyllion) ; XXVI, 38 (epic).

Masculine and feminine forms of the article, with nouns of

¹ Syntax, I, 37, p. 76, l. 12 ff. Bekker.

² Cf. Herondas, v, 52, and for parallels in Attic, where this form of expression is rare, Dem., 54, 7, *τῶν Πυθοδώρου* ; 43, 62 (*νόμος*), *τὰ τοῦ ἀποθανόντος*. Arist. Wasps, 1432, *τὰ Πιττάλου*. Lysias, 12, 12, *εἰς τ' ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ἐμοῦ*.

relation understood, are found as follows: II, 66, 146; III, 35 (?); IV, 21; V, 15; X, 15; XIV, 53 (?).¹

14. *The article with possessives and genitives of personal and reflexive pronouns.*—a. *With possessives.* The article with nouns accompanied by possessives, or genitives of pronouns, personal, reflexive, or demonstrative, may (1) distinguish the given object from similar objects in the possession of others (XV, 18), or (2) with deixis or anaphora designate a particular object, in the possession of the person indicated by the pronoun, as distinct from other objects of the same kind in his possession (XXI, 30), or (3) designate the given object as the only possession of its kind (XXI, 27). This last is the (*ἀναφορά*) *κατὰ μοναδικὴν κτήσιν* according to which Apollonius and other Greek grammarians account for the article in this construction.² If there is no such *ἀναφορά* the article may, according to Apollonius, be omitted. But, as we have seen, this is but one phase of the article in this form of expression. Only one case occurs in epic where the article is used (XXII, 59), in an elliptical expression: *τῆς σῆς (χώρης)*.

Position. With the exception of two cases, the possessive occupies the normal position between the article and noun,³ the first attributive position. The two exceptions are: V, 108, *τὸν φραγμὸν . . . τὸν ἄμῶν*, and XXIII, 36–37, *ἐν προθύροισι | τοῖσι τεοῖσιν*. The first attributive position is found: I, 7; II, 3, 39, 116, 146, 164; V, 128, 130; VI, 22; VIII, 75; X, 57; XII, 20; XIV, 30, 38; XV, 11; XXI, 27, 30; XXIII, 21, 26, 27, 41; XXIX, 6. The noun is to be supplied from the context in XV, 18; XXVII, 59; XXII, 59.

In one passage the manuscripts show the possessive in the predicative position, after the noun: XXVII, 58, *τῶμπέχονον πολήσας ἐμὸν ῥάκος*. This, and two examples, cited for this position in classical Greek, Soph. Ai., 573,⁴ Eur. Hippol., 683,

¹See Wendel, Jahrb., Suppl. 26, 1901, p. 33. Kaibel, Comic. Graec. Frg., I, p. 177, to Sophron frg. 145.

²See introduction.

³See Milden, *o. c.*

⁴See Jebb's note.

have been emended in various ways. The same position is found in the next to the last line of *Id.* XXVII, contained in MS. c. :¹ τὰν σύριγγα τεάν (MS. τεῶν).

In the omission of the article with possessives Theocritus shows considerable freedom. Of the one hundred occurrences of possessives (excluding vocatives and predicates, and counting the refrain of *Id.* II, but once) seventy-two are anarthrous. Of these, thirty-four are found in epic idylls, and of the remaining thirty-eight in Doric and Aeolic idylls, seventeen stand in prepositional phrases.

b. *With genitives of pronouns.*² This use of the article is post-Homeric.³ When the article is used, the genitives of personal pronouns and αὐτοῦ, eius, regularly take the partitive position, while genitives of reflexive pronouns, αὐτοῦ, ipsius, and ἀλλήλων stand in attributive positions. When an attributive is added, the genitives of personal pronouns and αὐτοῦ, eius, may stand in the attributive position before the substantive. There are few exceptions to these rules in Attic, and some of these have been removed by easy conjectures.⁴ Theocritus follows the same rules, offering but one possible exception to the partitive position of μεῦ in v, 2 (see below). No examples with the article are found in epic.

a. *With genitives of the personal pronouns.*⁵ The pronoun precedes, and in a few cases is separated from the article by intervening verbs: II, 69, 75, 81, 87, 93, 99, 105, 111, 117, 123, 129, 135 (refrain); v, 4, 19, 109; VI, 36; xv, 31, 69; xx, 5; xxiii, 43; xxix, 16; xxx, 9. The pronoun follows, occasionally separated from the noun: II, 126; VII, 119; VIII, 15, 63, 82 (odd. τοι); x, 36; xi, 55, 70; xv, 71; xxvii, 5. In III, 37, the genitive stands between the noun and an adjective added in the third attributive position: ὀφθαλμός μεν ὁ δεξιός. In v, 2, τό μεν νάκος, we find the only exception to the partitive position.

¹ See Ziegler, and Wilamowitz, ed., and Textg., p. 91, n. 1.

² Krueger, I, 47, 9, 12; II, 47, 9, 3 and 5. Kuehner, § 464, 4.

³ In the one instance cited for Homer, T. 185. χαίρω σεῦ . . . τὸν μῦθον ἀκούσας, σεῦ depends on ἀκούσας.

⁴ See Merriam, note to Hdt., VI, 30, 7.

⁵ Only μεῦ (ἐμεθεν), and σεῦ occur.

Few examples of this attributive position are cited from classical authors, and in all of them a particle or attributive is added, except Arist. Lys., 416, τῆς μου γυναικός (Meineke μου τῆς, others μοι). See Fuller, p. 103, for other examples and compare Herondas, v, 7, τό μεν αἶμα; vi, 41, τήν μεν γλῶσσαν. The position may be a late growth, as Cholmeley remarks. In the New Testament¹ an emphatic ὑμῶν may stand in the attributive position.

β. *With genitives of reflexives.* There is no exception to the regular attributive position in Theocritus: i, 92, τὸν αὐτῶ | ἄννε πικρὸν ἔρωτα²; xv, 131; v, 61; xxvii, 13.

γ. *The genitive of the demonstrative* follows the same rule: ii, 60.

δ. *The genitive of a relative* precedes in x, 4, ἃς τὸν πόδα.

Omission of the article with nouns accompanied by genitives of pronouns is comparatively infrequent in Theocritus. Seventeen cases of omission occur, but of these, six are in epic, and seven others occur with names of parts of the body.

c. The poets frequently combine the dative with the substantive as a dative of possession³ and the dative of personal pronouns then may stand between the article and its noun. There is much use of this dative in Homer.⁴ In Herodotus this use and position of the dative is not infrequent, but this position is also found when the dative is to be taken with the verb. In Attic prose⁵ where such a position of datives of personal pronouns occurs, the dative is usually a dative of possession. But when neither sense nor position demand the possessive interpretation, the dative is to be taken with the verb. Few cases occur in Theocritus where such datives stand between the article and noun, and scarcely one is certainly a dative of possession: iii, 1, τὰ δέ μοι αἶγες βόσκονται; iv, 62, τό τοι γένος; vii, 121, τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ. In other cases of this position the pronoun certainly goes with the

¹ Blass, N. T. Gram., p. 171.

² Cholmeley (and Wilamowitz), writes αὐτῶ, ipsius, "according to epic usage. Monro, Hom. Gram., § 252." But if αὐτῶ is Homeric, τὸν αὐτῶ π. ἔρ. is not Homeric (Monro, l. c.)

³ Krueger, ii, 48, 12,

⁴ Dyroff, "Geschichte des Pronomen Reflexivum."

⁵ Krueger, i, 48, 12, 2.

verb: VII, 43; X, 24, (cf. VII, 11); XXIX, 22. Other positions of the dative are more frequent and in no case is the possessive construction demanded: I, 146; II, 1; VI, 6; XV, 55; XX, 28, (cf. 21, 25, 27).

15. *The article with interrogatives.* In combination with an interrogative and substantive the article either points back to an object previously mentioned, or by prolepsis to one that is to be more closely defined in the following.¹ Theocritus uses this construction twice, and both times the article points back to an object mentioned by another speaker: V, 5, τὰν ποίαν σύριγγα, 8, τὸ ποῖον . . . νάκος, both times with contemptuous reference.

16. *The article with ἄλλος and ἕτερος.* The article is used with a noun accompanied by ἄλλος in the first attributive position, as a rule only when the reference is to the remainder of a given whole, "the rest."² Following examples of the construction occur in Theocritus, none besides the first attributive position being found: XVII, 17; XXIV, 61 (epic), τὸν ἄλλον . . . παῖδα (ἄλλον here = ἕτερον); XXVI, 24 (epic). Omission of the article with ἄλλος (ἄλλοι) and a noun is confined to epic idylls.³ With ἄλλος used substantively, the article is found: XIV, 60; (XXII, 178 (epic), ὧλλοι, v. l. ἄλλοι; XXVI, 15 (epic), ἄλλαι, vulg. ἄλλαι); XXII, 205, τὸν ἄλλον (= τὸν ἕτερον), with anaphora, "that other." With ἕτερος the article refers to a definite one of two individuals. In Homer the article is thus found occasionally.⁴ In a generic sense ἕτερος may or may not have the article. In Theocritus the article is found only with ἕτερος used substantively, once in epic: VII, 36; VIII, 91; XI, 32; XII, 14, (Ionic lyric); XXV, 255 (epic). Omission of the article is confined to epic idylls, save XXIX, 15 (Aeolic).

¹ Krueger, 50, 4, 7. Kuehner, § 461, A. 6.

² Cf. Apoll. Synt., I, 11, p. 38, l. 21 ff. Bekker; Krueger, I, 50, 4, 9. In Theocritus occasional shifting between ἄλλος and ἕτερος is noticeable.

³ The grammars tell us that οἱ ἄλλοι is found everywhere in Homer, (Monro, § 260, a, "passim"), but many of the examples are disputed, and the schol. to B, I says: "Ἄλλοι] ὅτι Ζηρόδοτος γράφει ὧλλοι (or ὧλλοι). ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς ἀσυνάρθρως ἐκφέρει. Where Homer has οἱ ἄλλοι, etc., demonstrative interpretation of the article may be applied, as in the two examples quoted above from epic idylls.

⁴ Kuehner, § 465, 10.

17. With *ἕκαστος* the article is used by Theocritus without a noun, in epic, xxv, 195, τὰ ἕκαστα, with anaphora. Ἐκαστος occurs but once outside the epic idylls (xiv, 19), without the article.

18. With *ἐκάτερος*, *ἄμφω* and *ἀμφοτέρως* nouns are generally articular in Attic prose, with the pronoun in the predicative position. The tragic poets and Herodotus¹ show examples of the omission of the article. In Theocritus *ἐκάτερος* does not occur. Ἄμφω, with anarthrous noun, occurs twice in epic idylls: xxiv, 109, < 107 >; xxv, 260. Elsewhere it is used substantively, without the article. Ἀμφοτέρως occurs once with an articular noun, xi, 70, τὼς πόδας ἀμφοτέρως μεν; with an anarthrous noun only in the epic xxii, (13, 30, 130), and elsewhere it is used substantively without the article.

19. With *οὗτος*, *ὅδε*, *τῆνος*, and *ἐκεῖνος*. When *οὗτος*, *ὅδε*, etc., are used with a noun, the noun usually has the article. It is, however, not the presence of the demonstrative that makes the article necessary. Demonstratives point to definite, known objects, and, since nouns referring to such objects are normally articular, it follows that nouns accompanied by demonstratives are normally articular. But, if a noun by itself cannot or regularly does not take the article, it does not take the article because of the presence of the demonstrative.² The relation of the demonstrative pronouns to the accompanying nouns is not that of attributives but of appositives, and hence the position which they occupy in respect to the article is not attributive, but predicative. In regard to the Theocritean use of the article with nouns accompanied by demonstratives, it may be said that Attic usage is generally followed, with occasional poetic omissions of the article which would not be permitted in prose. Ameis, (p. 36), contents himself with the

¹ Arist. Eccl., 837, Fuller, p. 114.

² See Krueger, i, 50, 11, 19 ff.—Kuehner, § 465, 4.—Fr. Blass, Rh. M., xliiv, 1889, pp. 6–23, on οὗτος in Demosthenes, rev. A. J. P., xi, 107.—H. Kallenberg, Jahresh. des Phil. Ver. zu Berlin, xxiii, 1897, pp. 204 ff., on the article with demonstratives in Herodotus.—L. Herbst, Philol. xxxviii, 503 ff., ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε and ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος in Thucydides; summarized, A. J. P., i, 241.—B. L. Gildersleeve "Problems in Greek Syntax," A. J. P., xxiii, pp. 8 and 123 ff.

simple statement that the article is added and omitted with the demonstratives (and with *αὐτός, πᾶς, ἐμός, σός, ἐός, κτέ.*) in the bucolic poets, referring for particulars to the index of these poets which he had begun.¹

a. *οὗτος, ὅδε, τῆνος* and *ἐκεῖνος*, with nouns unaccompanied by attributives, always stand in the predicative position. The pronoun may precede (first position), or follow the noun (second position). Intervening words often separate the demonstrative from the noun. *First position*: *οὗτος*, II, 28, 53; V, 102; VII, 51; VIII, 39; X, 41, 42, 45; XV, 44.—*ὅδε*, I, 65 (?); V, 72. Epigram, VI (XX), 1.—*τῆνος*, II, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42, 47, 52, 57, 62; IV, 15; V, 1, 15/16; VIII, 26.—*ἐκεῖνος* (*κῆνος*, Aeolic), XXVIII, 24.—*Second position*: *οὗτος*, II, 59; V, 30, 32; VIII, 23; XIV, 4; XXI, 65. Epigram, VII (XVI), 1.—*ὅδε*, IV, 12; V, 34, 41; VII, 31; VIII, 55; XVIII, 15.—*τῆνος*, II, 153; V, 117; XV, 8; XVI, 42 (epic); XVII, 118 (epic).

b. *With nouns accompanied by attributives.* When the articular noun is accompanied by an attributive, the demonstrative may, as in Attic, abandon its predicative position, and stand between the adjective modifier and the noun. So: I, 13, τὸ *κάπαντες τοῦτο*

¹ A few facts regarding the pronouns themselves, as they appear in Theocritus, may be of interest and not without value. As shown by the appended table, the colorless *οὗτος* remains in the lead, but *ὅδε*, and the Doric *τῆνος* play important roles, (10 *τῆνος* in the refrain of *id.* II), while *ἐκεῖνος* is unimportant.

	<i>Without nouns.</i>	<i>W. articular nouns.</i>	<i>W. anarthrous nouns.</i>	<i>Summary.</i>
<i>οὗτος</i> ...	51 (5 in epic).	23 (none in epic).	15 (6 in epic).	89 (11 in epic).
<i>ὅδε</i>	30 (8 " ").	11 (" " ").	27 (14 " ").	68 (22 " ").
<i>τῆνος</i> ...	25 (2 " ").	28 (2 " ").	8 (none " ").	61 (4 " ").
<i>ἐκεῖνος</i> .	8 (6 " ").	2 (none " ").	3 (" " ").	3 (6 " ").
Total.	114 (21 " ").	64 (2 " ").	53 (20 " ").	231 (20 " ").

It is to be noted especially, that of the cases of anarthrous nouns accompanied by a demonstrative, a large percentage (20 in 53) are found in epic idylls (confined to *οὗτος* and *ὅδε*), while there are only two cases where the article is used in epic (XVI, 42; XVII, 118), both with substantivized adjectives, and both with the Doric *τῆνος*. Interesting too is the preponderance of *ὅδε* in epic idylls, and the frequency of *τῆνος* with nouns, in Doric idylls.

γεώλοφον; II, 116; V, 101.—XXX, 1.—I, 7; XIV, 26.—Epigram, I, 1. In all other cases the demonstrative remains in a predicative position. The adjective may stand in the first attributive position, and the demonstrative precede the complex: IV, 59; V, 17; VIII, 86;—or follow it: XV, 34. The adjective may occupy the second attributive position and the demonstrative precede the complex: V, 147; VII, 151. Epigram, III (x), 1 f.—or stand between the noun and the following articular adjective: I, 1/2, 22/23; V, 64/65. The adjective, finally, may stand in the third attributive position and the demonstrative precede the noun: II, 30, ὅδε ῥόμβος ὁ χάλκεος, or stand between the noun and the attributive: I, 120. In two cases, where the noun has more than one attributive, the article is omitted with the first, which precedes the noun: I, 126 f. αἰπύ τε σάμα | τῆνο Λυκαονίδαο, τὸ καὶ μακάρεσσιν ἀγητόν; Epigram, I, 5 f. κεραὸς τράγος οὗτος ὁ μᾶλος | τερμίνθου τρώγων. The omission of the article before αἰπύ and κεραὸς is poetical.

c. *Omission of the article with nouns accompanied by οὗτος, ὅδε, τῆνος and ἐκείνος.* As was stated above, a noun which of itself cannot or regularly does not take the article, remains anarthrous when used with a demonstrative pronoun. This is the case, for example, when οὗτος (etc.) is subject, the noun predicate, or when the noun is added as subsidiary predicate to the demonstrative in the accusative case (f. i. XXIII, 21, 35; XXVII, 55). Besides these constructions, there are a number of cases where the omission of the article is more or less general in Attic Greek. This is true 1), in the case of proper nouns, tho in Theocritus, the only two proper nouns used with demonstratives have the article: V, 17 and 102; 2), when the demonstrative points forward to a relative clause, as in XVI, 73 (epic); XXIII, 33, 46; XXIV, 84 (epic); 3), when the demonstrative points to an object actually present, as, ὅδε I, 128; II, 50; VI, 33; XXII, 54, 62 (epic); XXV, 18, 29 (epic); XXVII, 49. Epigram, II (VII), 4;—οὗτος II, 15, 132; III, 6;—τῆνος VII, 98; 4), when ὅδε is used with much the same force as τοῖόςδε: VII, 125. Epigram, III (x), 3.—Of the remaining twenty-six cases in which the article is omitted, and which cannot be put under these categories, twelve occur in epic, two in the Ionic XII (12, 34), one in Aeolic (XXIX, 14), one in

the Berenike fragment. The ten cases remaining for Doric are: οὔτος II, 65.—ὅδε VII, 83; XVIII, 58.—τῆνος I, 36; II, 84; V, 43; VII, 63; XV, 15; XXVII, 40.—ἐκείνος IX, 29 (κείνοισι v. l. τήνοισι). Evidently the number of poetic omissions of the article in Doric idylls is comparatively small.

20. *The demonstrative adjectives* τοιοῦτος, τοῖος, τοιόσδε, τόσος, τοσόσδε, τοσσῆνος and τηλίκος are regularly used by Theocritus without the article, whether substantively or with nouns. Of fifty-seven occurrences of these adjectives, only fifteen are adjectival, nine of them in epic idylls. Of the six instances in Doric idylls only one would in Attic Greek require the article, namely XXIII, 16, τόσαν φλόγα τᾶς Κυθερείας, "the fire of Aphrodite, so great," as just described. The other occurrences are: II, 161; VII, 149, 153; VIII, 8; XVIII, 32.

21. *The article with αὐτός.* Αὐτός, "ipse," "self," as a substantive pronoun, if used with a noun, stands in apposition with the noun. Hence if the noun is articular, αὐτός in this sense stands in the predicative position. The article is used when the noun refers to a definite, known person or object.¹ The examples of this construction in Theocritus are: IV, 5, 15/16;² V, 14 (?), cf. XXVII, 35.—VIII, 80; X, 19; XI, 12; XXVII, 61.

Αὐτός, "idem," "the same," is an adjective, and, in conjunction with an articular noun, occupies an attributive position, usually the first. In Attic Greek, proper nouns, and common nouns used as proper nouns, omit the article with αὐτός, "idem." In Theocritus αὐτός is confined almost entirely to the intensive use discussed above. Two cases only of ὁ αὐτός were found: XVIII, 22, δρόμος ωύτός (rare position) and XXVI, 23 (epic), καὶ Αὐτονόας ῥυθμὸς ωύτός. In XI, 34, ωύτός is a doubtful variant for οὔτος.

Nouns with αὐτός, "ipse," are anarthrous eight times outside the epic idylls. Of these, three are cases of proper nouns: VII, 5, 100; XXX, 31. The others are: II, 89; VII, 70; XXI, 17; XXVII, 63. Epigram, V (XIII), 6.

¹ Krueger, I, 50, 11, 14-18. Kuehner, § 465, 4, Anm. 6 and f.

² αὐτὰ . . . τῶστιά, "only her bones," cf. II, 89, αὐτὰ . . . ὅστιά, "only bones." For αὐτός = μόνος cf. IV, 15; V, 85; X, 19; XI, 12; XVIII, 12.

22. *The article with πᾶς, ἅπας, σύμπας and ὅλος.*¹ A noun used with πᾶς, etc., (as with οὗτος, etc.,) takes the article if it is normally articular without πᾶς. A noun used with πᾶς (etc.,) in the sense "whole" or "all" takes the article, therefore, in Attic when there is definite reference to known objects. Where there is no such definite reference, the article may be omitted, but the generic article may also be used. When πᾶς is used indefinitely in the sense of "every," the noun is anarthrous. If the noun with πᾶς has the article, two cases are distinguished. When πᾶς (πάντες) is used attributively, in the first attributive position, the whole is thought of in contrast with its parts. When, on the other hand, πᾶς (πάντες) stands in the predicative position, it merely adds a further modifier without implying a contrast with the parts.

In the attributive position πᾶς is found but once in Theocritus: XXI, 14, ὁ πᾶς πόρος.

In the predicative position πᾶς (πάντες) occurs as follows: a. preceding the noun: XXVII, 33; XXVIII, 25; b. following the noun: I, 139; V, 107, τὰ θηρία πάντα (generic); VIII, 16; XIII, 67; XXI, 31; XXII, 22; XXIV, 38, the last two in epic.

Without accompanying noun πᾶς may have the article, individual or generic. Of the cases found in Theocritus none stand in epic idylls. They are: III, 18, τὸ πᾶν, adverbial; cf. VII, 98, τὰ πάντα.—XIV, 50; XVIII, 22. Epigram, VIII (XVII), 9. In XVI, 102, τοῖς πᾶσι (epic), τοῖς is a relative, and in XVII, 85 and XXII, 99, (both epic) the article is a substantive pronoun. Without the article πᾶς is used in this way thirty-four times in Doric idylls.

Omission of the article with nouns accompanied by πᾶς. When πᾶς = "every" is used with a noun the article is omitted in Attic. So also in Theocritus: I, 50, 102; VII, 26; XXI, 45; XXV, 53 (epic). Besides these cases, there are fifty instances in Theocritus where πᾶς is used with anarthrous nouns. Of these, twenty-nine stand in epic idylls, and one in the Ionic XII. Of the twenty cases remaining for Doric idylls and epigrams (mostly plurals), the

¹ Krueger, I, 50, 11, 8; II, 50, 10, 2. Kuehner, § 465, 6. Kallenberg on πᾶς in Herodotus, J. B. des Phil. Ver. zu Berlin, XXIII, 1897, pp. 204 ff.

majority contain no definite reference and, hence, are naturally anarthrous. Actual omission of the article may be noted in the following instances: II, 89, *πάσαι τρίχες*, "all my hair;" VII, 109, *κατὰ χροῖα πάντα*, "all thy skin;" IX, 33; XI, 31; XIX, 3; XXIII, 56; XXVII, 33. Epigram, II (VII) 6.

Nouns accompanied by *ἅπας* and *σύμπας* (once, XII, 7), are always anarthrous in Theocritus, even where there is definite reference, as in II, 56, *μεν μέλαν . . . αἷμα . . . ἅπαν*;¹ XVII, 41 (epic); XXII, 86 (epic).

Ὅλος appears once with an articular noun, in predicative position: Epigram, VII (XVI), 6, *ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα*; once with an anarthrous noun: XXIX, 4 (Aeolic), where *ἀκόλας* is a variant for *οὐκ ὅλας*.

23. *The article with cardinal numerals* refers to definite objects well known or previously mentioned: VI, 22, *τὸν ἑμὸν τὸν ἔνα γλυκύν*, cf. 36 and XI, 53.—XI, 6; XIV, 29; XVII, 19. Add XVI, 90 (epic), where the article may be substantival.—Hence, the article is used in designating the parts after a whole number has been mentioned: XXVI, 6 (epic), *κάμον δυοκαίδεκα βωμούς | τὼς τρεῖς . . . τὼς ἐννέα*.

Nouns accompanied by *ordinals* are frequently anarthrous.² A noun so used is articular but once in Theocritus: I, 3, *μετὰ Πᾶνα τὸ δεύτερον ἄθλον ἀποισῆ*. Elsewhere the article appears only with ordinal numerals used substantively, or as adverbial neuters: X, 29; XVII, 75; XVIII, 4; XXII, 4; XXV, 240.

24. *With superlatives*, as with ordinal numerals, omission of the article is easy and frequent. With nouns expressed, the article is used: VII, 10, cf. XXI, 19.—VIII, 62; XI, 35; XXIV, 63 (epic). Without accompanying nouns, superlatives with the article are found a, as substantives: II, 143; VII, 98. Epigram, IV (XII), 2, the last two being appositives; b, as adverbs: VII, 59; XV, 58; XXIII, 40.

¹ The only instance in Doric with accompanying noun.

² For Attic Greek see John Thompson, Cl. R., XX, 6, 304.

25. *With comparatives* the article generally implies contrast or anaphora. With nouns Theocritus has the following: xv, 139 (apposition); xviii, 6 (anaphora to l. 1.); xx, 43 (apposition). With comparatives used substantively and adverbially we find the article in: i, 20; v, 71; viii, 17; xxiv, 72; xxvi, 32 (the last two in epic).

LIFE.

Winfred George Leutner was born in Cleveland, Ohio, March 1, 1879. He graduated from Adelbert College of Western Reserve University in 1901. In the fall of the same year, he entered the Johns Hopkins University as graduate student in Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit. In 1903, he was appointed Fellow in Greek, but resigned before entering upon the Fellowship, to become instructor in Greek at Adelbert College. He resumed graduate work at the Johns Hopkins University as Fellow by Courtesy in the fall of 1904.

He attended the lectures of Professors Gildersleeve, K. F. Smith, Bloomfield, Miller, and Wilson, to all of whom he takes this opportunity to express his indebtedness. To Professors Gildersleeve and Miller he is especially grateful for constant inspiration and guidance in the prosecution of his principal studies.

May, 1905.

2008 10 1948

2008 10 1948

NOV '67 H

168860

SEP 22 1973

3088

5-1084816

JAN 18 1976 H

Gt 14.398
The article in Theocritus ...
Widener Library 005783677



3 2044 085 171 353